

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW.

FEBRUARY, 1857.

ART. I.—SPANISH LITERATURE.

1. *El Conde Lucanor*. De Don Juan Manuel. Paris. 1840. 12mo.
2. *Cronica de D. Alvaro de Luna*. Madrid. 1784. 4to.
3. *Coplas*. De Don Jorge Manrique. Madrid. 1779. 8vo.
4. *Cartas de Antonio Perez, y Relacion summaria de las Prisiones*. De Antonio Perez. Paris. 1603. 8vo.
5. *Antonio Perez et Philippe II*. Par M. Mignet. Paris. 1846. 8vo.

RECENT events in Spain appear to demonstrate that, unlike the rest of Europe, that nation still retains the wild, irregular, and impressionable character of the Middle Ages; and whilst the other great branches of the European family have painfully struggled towards adolescence, the inhabitants of the Peninsula are as childish as they were five hundred years since. Just as in the days of Alfonso XI., of Don Juan II., or of Phelippe II., the personal vices or weaknesses of the monarch were allowed to disturb the whole political condition of the country, and statesmen, warriors, or favourites were mercilessly sacrificed in order to gratify the passions of the tyrant of the day—so it would seem that even now such a creature as Isabella II. is allowed by her subjects to sport with the reputations of grave senators; to make or mar the position of soldiers of fortune; to set up or pull down, at the will of the moment, ministers or minions; and, in fact, to repeat, amidst the shouts of reprobation of indignant Europe, the follies and crimes of former days. Napoleon the Great used to say that “Africa began at the Pyrenees;” and if the Spaniards tolerate for any length of time the existing sad parody of government which disgraces their noble land, Europe will

adopt the phrase as a true statement of their moral condition. Yet they who wished well for the progress of our race, had argued better things from the manifest awakening of the national mind, produced by the most iniquitous and most fatal blunder of the French emperor. The long and sanguinary struggle for independence at the beginning of this century had left a leaven of intellectual activity which could not even be suppressed by the revived despotism of Ferdinand VII., or by the awful confusion of the civil war following his decease. Such men as Martinez della Rosa, Jovellanos, Balmes, Torreno, Condé, Ochoa, De los Rios, Breton de los Herreros, Hartzenbusch, Navarrete, Donoso Cortes, and many others whose names are but little known to us Englishmen—who, as a rule, care but little for foreign reputations—such men could only have forced themselves into notice during a period in which the best intellect of their countrymen was in a ferment. Substantially, too, between 1814 and 1855, Spain was advancing in political freedom and in its material wealth, notwithstanding the serious lets and hindrances it encountered from Chartists and Royalists, from foreign occupation, and from Christinos or Carlists. But now, when there appeared to be a possibility of arriving at some stable government, when the most honest man in Spain had been carried into power upon the shoulders of the people, almost literally, we find that a wilful, and, we fear, we must add, a depraved and debauched young woman, is able to dash the whole glittering fabric to the ground, and to submit the destinies of a nation, loyal, chivalric, and personally brave to a fault, to the passions of a set of rapacious, cowardly, and unprincipled sycophants! Truly, little wisdom appears to be necessary to those whom Providence calls to govern this magnificent portion of the world, if this gross insult to the common sense of the Spanish people be tolerated for any length of time! We are intimately convinced that this will not be the case; and to our minds the Bourbon dynasty of Spain is doomed hereafter to expiate its follies and its crimes as certainly as the Bourbons of Naples, or as those of France did before either of them. It may be some years before the cup of their iniquities is filled; but the life of a nation is long, and the day of reckoning must sooner or later come. Isabella and her advisers may flatter themselves that they are but re-enacting some chapters of the past history of their country, which either met with the approbation of Spaniards, or at least were accompanied by worldly success; and they may believe that the measures which succeeded in former times can be repeated now with impunity. But no such chapters can ever be re-enacted; for the spirit of the age changes continually; and, to her cost, Isabella will find, we are convinced, that it is

impossible to maintain, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, a despotism which could hardly support itself in the seventeenth; and that, in depriving herself violently of the alliance of the intellectual classes of her country, she has thrown them into the ranks of the Revolutionists. It is not, however, our purpose to notice the extraordinary events which have marked the progress of the painful farce lately played out at Madrid, in any detail. They have been here referred to principally because they recalled to our recollection an almost forgotten class of literature, and a series of political events strikingly similar to those we have lately witnessed; and perhaps they may serve, in their turn, to throw light upon some national peculiarities to which it will be necessary to refer in the course of our observations upon the books cited at the head of this article.

The first of these books, "El Conde Lucanor," is a very remarkable apologue, written in the early part of the fourteenth century by don Juan Manuel, grandson of Ferdinand III., surnamed St. Ferdinand, king of Castille and Leon; but the interest attached to the book at the present day depends more upon the personal character and history of its author than upon his illustrious birth. The father of don Juan Manuel, seventh son of St. Ferdinand, whose name was also Juan Manuel, appears also to have played an equivocal part in the struggle between his own brother Alfonso el Sabio, and their nephew Sancho the Brave, and to have leaned towards the latter in his revolt. Don Juan Manuel, the father, died at a comparatively early age, about 1284, leaving our hero, then only two years old, and a sister, subsequently married to Alfonso, Infant of Portugal, under the care of their mother Beatrix of Savoy. The youthful don Juan was brought up under the care of his cousin, Don Sancho el Bravo; and, so long as the latter lived, enjoyed all the advantages of his royal connexions. On the death of Sancho, however, the crown passed to Ferdinand IV., and our youthful don Juan Manuel became for a time the object of his suspicions. Towards the close of his short reign, Ferdinand was, nevertheless, induced to confide in the abilities and fidelity of his cousin, and in order to oppose a formidable coalition against his crown, headed by the Infant don Pedro, he conferred upon Juan Manuel, at the early age of twenty-eight, the important position of grand steward of his own palace, and gave him the government of the kingdom of Murcia, with the title of Adelentado Major. Shortly afterwards, Ferdinand appears to have quarrelled with don Juan; for, at the period of his sudden death in 1312, the latter was in a species of banishment, and don Pedro himself was thus enabled to take possession of the

regency of his infant sovereign, Alonso XI., to the exclusion of the mother and the grandmother of the latter, as well as of the other members of the royal family. Don Pedro, however, did not long retain this position; for Doña Costança, the young widow of Ferdinand, obtained possession of the person of Alonso, and endeavoured, by the assistance of don Juan Manuel, to displace don Pedro, who, in his turn, endeavoured to strengthen himself by an alliance with Doña Maria, the mother of Ferdinand. Doña Costança died within a short period of these civil dissensions; and, upon her decease, an attempt was made to constitute a joint council of regency, consisting of the queen-grandmother and the Infantas dons Pedro and Juan; but the latter were too nearly equal in power, too jealous, and, we fear we must add, too unscrupulous, to sacrifice any of their private feelings or interests for the good of the state. In all probability, the origin of the quarrel which imperilled the above-mentioned desirable arrangement of the regency, is to be found in the avarice of don Pedro; but, however this may be, it is certain that a civil war broke out between the regents and their powerful vassal don Juan Manuel. Doña Maria, with the hope of diverting attention from these domestic quarrels, urged her turbulent nobles into a war against the Moors of Granada, and a large army was dispatched upon this crusade under the personal guidance of the Infants. Bold and unscrupulous though these might be, they were evidently very poor soldiers; for they allowed themselves to be attacked and defeated by an inferior force of the Moors, and fell victims to their own carelessness and incapacity, leaving Doña Maria alone to contend with the difficulties of a long and stormy regency. The cruel defeat of the Castilian forces had rendered it the more important for the queen to secure the support of don Juan Manuel, the only man who could have efficiently repaired the loss so sustained; but, for some reasons, which it would be difficult now to ascertain, she exercised all her influence and power to keep him from the position to which his talents, his family connexion, and his position entitled him. At length Doña Maria was, nevertheless, convinced of the necessity for the alliance of don Juan Manuel, and an understanding upon the subject of the regency was arrived at, by which his pretensions were reconciled, in appearance at least, with those of the Infants dons Philippe and Juan; but, unfortunately, at this precise period she died (in 1322), and then the unruly passions of the relatives of the youthful monarch burst forth in full fury.

The majority of the King Alonso XI., which was declared in 1325, modified the terms of these dissensions, without putting at once a stop to them. Alonso was an energetic, violent, cruel

monarch, who seems to have considered that the end justified the means adopted, and he did not hesitate to rid himself of troublesome rivals by murder, or by any other violent measure. Towards don Juan Manuel he behaved with singular duplicity, and at last provoked him to such an extent, that the latter renounced the homage due to the king according to the principles of feudalism, and joined a powerful league of the kings of Arragon and of Granada, which seemed likely to destroy for ever the power of the boyish monarch of Castille, who, moreover, had given himself up to the guidance of two unworthy favourites, Garcilaso de la Vega and Alvar Nunez. The civil war continued with various fortunes, until about the year 1335, when Alonso's military skill and indomitable energy had at length so far broken the resources of his various domestic and foreign enemies, that the former were glad to make their peace with their king, and to combine their efforts with his, in order to resist a great movement of the Moors of Africa, undertaken at this period, in defence of their co-religionists of Spain. A fierce and rather absurd combat, in which the Spanish naval force, under don Alfonso Tenorio, was annihilated, had laid open Gibraltar to the Moors, and they had landed large bodies of troops, finally united under the orders of Al-Mohacen; they were soon afterwards attacked by the Spanish troops under Alonso, and his formerly rebellious, but then faithful relative, Juan Manuel, and by them defeated with great slaughter at Tarifa, whilst the capture of Algesiras, after a long and obstinate siege, prepared the final destruction of the Moorish kingdom, which was in fact only delayed to the time of Ferdinand and Isabella by the confusion and civil wars occasioned by the sudden death of Alonso in 1350. Our friend don Juan Manuel had been gathered to his fathers three years previously, closing a troubled and adventurous life in the quiet enjoyment of honour and worldly prosperity. He left his children in the possession of many of his dignities and feudal possessions; and though his direct legitimate descendants soon became extinct, a large portion of the highest nobility of Spain still claims a relationship to this accomplished soldier and scholar, whose faults, qualities, and fortunes must be considered alike to be characteristic of the age in which he lived—an age, it is to be observed, presenting extraordinary symptoms of vigour in the intellect of the inhabitants of Southern Europe, although that vigour was, after all, of a semi-barbarous kind. About this time, Dante and his friend Cino da Pistora, and Guido Cavalcante lived; the Guelphs and the Ghibellines tore Italy with their dissensions; the Catholic world was scandalized by the transfer of the Papal seat from Rome to Avignon; the Tem-

plars were suppressed; the Turks made their appearance in European politics; and the Lollards, after the Albigenses had been crushed by De Montfort, were actively spreading their doctrines. There was, in those days, a great movement going forward in men's minds, and society was earnestly labouring to disentangle itself from the thralls of feudalism; and, though such persons as Juan Manuel, who was, in the main, a purely ambitious and selfish man, might not clearly define to themselves the character they were playing in the world's great drama, yet insensibly they were compelled by what it is agreed to call "the force of circumstances," to assist in working out the national unity of their respective nations; and, in don Juan's case also, to develope the language and tastes of their countrymen.

Don Juan Manuel, indeed, was an author of very great mark, especially when we consider the circumstances of his active life; and he appears to have followed the Muses with considerable success in more than one branch. From the introduction to one of the manuscripts of his works, it would seem that he attached great importance to their preservation; and it is rather curious that the epilogue he introduces to justify his own anxiety on this score, corresponds exactly with an anecdote recorded by Balbo as having occurred to Dante. But without endeavouring to ascertain who was the original Simon Pure of the tale, in which an enraged poet is made to adopt vigorous means for punishing some tasteless mechanic who had *murdered* his verses in his hearing, we may observe that the precautions taken by don Juan were utterly defeated by the carelessness of the monks to whom the manuscripts were entrusted. Many of our author's prose works have been lost; only a very few fragments of his poetry have survived to grace the *Canconiero General*; whilst the ancient editions, and the most recent translations of his great and most universally known production, "El Conde Lucanor," differ from one another in so extraordinary a manner, that it is almost impossible to regard them as representatives of the same subject. The less generally known productions of Don Juan Manuel are, to quote them in the order given by M. Puibusque ("Le Comte Lucanor," Paris, 8vo., 1854, p. 95):

1. "El Caballero y el Escudero."
2. "El libro de la respuesta a las tres preguntas que le fizo Don Juan Alonzo."
3. "El libro del Infante."
4. "El libro de los Estados."
5. "El libro de la Caça."

According to the same authority, these are all inedited, and from the short analysis he gives of them, they appear to present many beautiful passages, and many singular illustrations of the moral and metaphysical doctrines which were received in Southern Europe in the early part of the fourteenth

century. Alas! it is to be feared that no efforts will be made by Spaniards now *in power* to complete the publication of the entire works of an author who confers so much honour on their country; and, unless some German or American amateur shall undertake the task, there seems to be small ground for hoping soon to possess the almost forgotten treatises before-mentioned. The "*Conde Lucanor*," has, however, been treated with more attention, and has been frequently reproduced both in Spain and elsewhere: a preference which may, no doubt, be explained by the more popular nature of its subject, and by the more fascinating style of its composition. The majority of the inedited works of Don Juan Manuel are, indeed, little else than dry moral disquisitions; whilst the "*Conde Lucanor*" is a very quaint and amusing collection of epilogues; the forerunner, in fact, of La Fontaine's and of "Gay's Fables."

There is something peculiarly unsatisfactory in the state of public opinion—that is to say, of the literary public—on the subject of "*El Conde Lucanor*." The first edition was published in Seville, in the year 1575, and the last reprint of the Spanish text we have been able to procure, was published in Paris, by A. Keller, in 1840. We have collated these two editions carefully, and find that, with the exception of some trifling alterations in the arrangement of the paragraphs, and some insignificant modifications in the orthography, they are substantially the same. In 1854, however, M. Puibusque, an eminent French writer upon Spanish literature, published in Paris, a book which professed to be a translation of "*El Conde Lucanor*," but this differs so widely from either the first Seville edition, or the last Paris reprint of the Spanish work, that, as we said before, it is almost impossible to consider the French translation as having been based upon the same original. The very number of the apologues differs slightly in these respective productions. M. Puibusque gives fifty tales; De Argote y Molina, the first editor, like A. Keller, the last, only gives forty-nine; whilst the subjects, the modes of treatment, but especially the order of the tales, differ in the most extraordinary manner. M. Puibusque talks, indeed, of his having consulted some original and forgotten manuscripts of Juan Manuel; but he does not mention that he had seen any such manuscript of "*El Conde Lucanor*;" and, indeed, he refers to Bouterwek's notice of this work, in such a peculiar manner, that it would be impossible for any casual reader to suspect even that the German critic had consulted an example in anywise differing from the translation thus mysteriously introduced. There can, however, be no doubt, from the text of Bouterwek's work, and from the quotations which are given in the notes, that he had never

seen, or heard of any edition of "El Conde Lucanor" different from that originally published by De Molina. It is true, that in the foot-note to page 95 of M. Puibusque's Introductory Essay "On the Origin of the Spanish Apologue," he states, that the second MS., in the National Library of Madrid, differs essentially from the reproduction by De Molina, in the order of the chapters; and in a previous passage (in the text, page 94), he says, that the first MS. "contains the twenty-eighth example, which is wanting in the other copies." But M. Puibusque makes no direct attack upon the correctness of De Molina's reproduction of "El Conde Lucanor," and his reference to Bouterwek's notice of the generally received editions throws additional doubt and obscurity upon the whole subject. Unfortunately, we have neither the means, nor the leisure, to probe this affair to the bottom; but it is one which requires explanation, and, for our own parts, we must confess, that at present we regard the authenticity of M. Puibusque's translation with feelings even stronger than those of suspicion. Those strange tales of Ossian and of Rowley's poems flit before our memory when we endeavour to discover the object of what we suspect to be a species of mystification.

For the present, then, and until M. Puibusque justifies the right of his book to the title of a new and more correct reproduction, we must refer to the "Conde Lucanor" as presented to the world originally in 1575, by the learned Gonzalo de Argote y Molina, and reproduced in the edition of 1840, by the Parisian editor. It consists of a series of apologues addressed to his patron by a certain Patronio, the *consejero*, or adviser, of the imaginary Conde Lucanor, who would appear from the context to have been rather a silly nobleman, requiring, and seeking advice under an infinite number of circumstances. The Conde invariably begins by explaining the reasons for his perplexity, and Patronio replies by a tale conveying a moral, or a piece of advice, in the form of one of those rhyming proverbs of which the Spaniards have been at all times so fond, and these proverbs the Conde is represented as committing to writing for his future guidance in the world. The tales themselves are clothed, it may be observed, in a quaint mediæval Castillian form, and are expressed in a language much more resembling the *Langue d'Oc* than the Spanish of the present day; but they can hardly claim merit on the score of their originality, for many of their subjects had already been treated by Æsop and Phædrus amongst the nations of classical antiquity, by the Brahmins of India, and the Saracenic invaders of Southern Europe, and occasionally by the troubadours and the trouvères of the earlier periods of Romance literature. The apologues are, however, well intro-

duced to illustrate the advice Patronio intended to convey, and the morals with which they conclude are pithily, and often elegantly expressed—a remark, by the way, it would be necessary to extend to nearly the whole class of rhyming Spanish proverbs, for these indeed constitute one of the peculiar and characteristic manifestations of the intellect of that singular nation. Bouterwek has quoted a few of the morals inserted by don Juan Manuel in his famous work, and, at the risk of repetition, we shall reproduce some of them here, together with a few of the omitted ones, which we think equally worthy of notice; observing simply, that it is difficult to translate expressions of such a decidedly idiomatic character, and that, therefore, we crave indulgence for our shortcomings:—

“If you have done something good, however small it be, make it great, for the good never dies.”

“In the beginning, every man should teach his wife how she should behave.”

“He who is really a man, will surely succeed; he who is not, will be sure to come to ruin.”

“He who advises you to be reserved with your friends, seeks to deceive you without witnesses.”

“Never risk your money upon the advice of a poor man.”

“Be careful that you are not conquered by foreigners, for you may be cured from any evil by your own countrymen.”

“Do good with good intentions throughout your life, if you desire to attain true glory.”

“Delicacy of feeling removes all evil propensities; by its inspirations a man does good without design.”

This is one of the most difficult of Don Juan's maxims to transfer into our language, and yet to retain the vigour and point of the original; in Spanish it is as follows:—

“La vergüenza todos males parte
Por ella face ome bien sin arte.”

“Gain the real treasures; avoid false ones.”

“Do not sacrifice yourself for one who will not make any sacrifice to please you.”

“Never complain of that which God does to you, for whatever He wills must be for your good.”

“From children's manners you may form an opinion of what they will be when they grow up.”

“Take this for certain, as it is a proved truth, that honour and great vices can never exist together.”

“Do not deceive yourself, or fancy that any man would willingly injure himself for your sake.”

“By God's grace, and by good counsel, a man may extricate himself from difficulties, and attain what he desires.”

"He who is well seated should not rise."

"Be sure that he who praises you for what you do not possess, desires to take from you that which you really have."

"Never be ashamed of your poverty, for you will surely see somebody poorer than yourself."

"Never believe what you hear from your enemy."

"For this passing world do not lose that which is eternal."

"Do not at once spend all that you gain, but live such a life as shall enable you to die with honour and respect."

"If in the commencement you do not show what you are, you will not be able to do so when you desire it."

"He who does not place his trust in God, will die unhappily, and meet with bad fortune."

To our minds these maxims contain much common sense and good feeling; the better, indeed, because there is throughout them a reference to the higher duties of our race, and the earnest conviction of the importance of obeying the intentions of the All-wise and All-good Creator of the moral law. This feeling was by no means uncommon amongst even those who were prominently engaged in the very equivocal transactions of public life during the Middle Ages; and, therefore, there should be no more reason for our surprise at discovering it in the case of the turbulent and ambitious don Juan Manuel, than in the case of the equally turbulent, but more unfortunate Dante, his contemporary. But, somehow or other, we do not expect to discover traces of a deep and sincere religious or moral conviction amongst those who have been personally concerned in the civil wars, conspiracies, and atrocities of a semi-barbarous age; and we are almost startled at the exhibition thus afforded of the inconsistencies involved by the mixed nature of man. Ultimately, no doubt, these proofs of the co-existence of a sincere faith with a practice of worldly behaviour very different, alas! must lead us to hope still, hope ever, of its perfectibility; but the phenomenon is not the less curious, and the contradictions thus shown to exist in the characters of great men, prove that De la Rochefoucauld was right when he said that "it was easier to understand man in the abstract than in the particular instance." Be this as it may, there is hardly anything in "El Conde Lucanor," which the most fastidious reader could object to; and, in addition to the sound moral lessons it conveys, it may be read with interest for the sake of the tales themselves. The old familiar story of the man, his son, and his ass, is charmingly told in the twenty-fourth example of the editions which follow De Molina's text (the second of Puibusque's arrangement); our old acquaintance, the fox and the crow, reappears in the twenty-sixth example of De Molina, and in the fifth of Puibusque; the

tale of the grasshopper and the ant is given in the thirty-sixth example of the old editions, and the twenty-third of the modern translation; whilst the striking oriental tale of the "Taming of the Shrew," by the newly-married husband cutting off his wife's pet cat's head on the first evening of their nuptials, is recorded at full length in the forty-fifth example of the first, and the thirty-fifth of the last of these editors. They are substantially the same in both—as are also the tales relating to our Richard Cœur de Lion, and to his worthy antagonist Saladin, the *preux chevaliers*, the objects of unbounded admiration of the Middle Ages; but Puibusque has contrived to destroy the spirit and peculiar charm of the original, so that on this score also we consider that it would be desirable to direct further attention to this remarkable and interesting collection of what may be truly called "wise saws," even if it be not one of "modern instances." In his edition, Argote y Molina inserted a brief notice of the ancient Castilian poetry, and a glossary of the words which had become obsolete in his day; both of these subjects require to be re-touched, and the recent investigations into the history of the languages and literature of Southern Europe would greatly facilitate their execution. Will no one render this service to the cause of letters, or perform this act of justice to the memory of don Juan Manuel?

The persons who either gave rise to, or wrote, the other works to which we have called attention, were not of such noble extraction as don Juan Manuel, though they exercised an influence nearly as decided upon the history of their country. The "Cronica de don Alvaro de Luna" which we have consulted, appears from the very able prologue affixed to the Madrid reprint of 1784, and written by don Josef Miguel de Flores, to have been the production of some unknown servant of the Condestable de Luna, who had the means of access to family documents, and had been personally acquainted with the man whose fortunes he related. From some internal evidence, De Flores fixes the date of the composition of the Chronicle about 1453 or 1460; and he states that the first edition appeared in Milan, in 1546. The learned editor remarks upon the affection and the prolixity with which the words and deeds of the great Condestable are recorded; and he calls attention to the singular contempt for anything like chronological accuracy which prevails throughout the work; but he also dwells upon the beauties of the style, and the graces and elegance of language to be noticed in the Chronicle. De Flores was evidently puzzled by, amongst other things, the number of French words and idioms to be found in this mediæval history, and he endeavoured to account for it by the supposition that the French knights,

who came to assist in the wars against the Moors of Spain, imported their language into the courts they came to assist. At the present day, another explanation would be given of this fact; and it would, in all probability, be referred to the mutual connexion of both the French and Spanish languages with the lost *Langue d'Oc*. This casual reminder of a lost tongue is singularly interesting to the philological student, but as our limits will not allow us to follow the investigation thus thrown in our way to its final conclusion, we must turn at once to our more immediate subject.

As far as can be gathered from the obscure text of the somewhat apocryphal "*Cronica*" under notice, "the magnificent, very virtuous, and highly favoured don Alvaro de Luna, Master of Santiago, and Constable of Castille," was born about the year 1388 or 1390, of the noble family of Luna, one of the most important members of the aristocracy of Arragon, which had passed into Castille upon the overthrow of Don Pedro by Don Enrique. This particular civil war would, we may observe, afford an episode of surpassing interest to us on account of the prominent part we took under the guidance of our Black Prince, in favour of Pedro the Cruel, against Enrique de Trastamara, supported by Duguesclin; but we are compelled also to pass over it for the present, and to content ourselves by stating that upon Enrique de Trastamara securing the crown by his brother's murder—so strangely were the laws of public morality then confused or ignored!—he hastened to confer the dignity of "*Mayordomo mayor*," together with some important territorial possessions, upon don Juan Martinez de Luna, the grandfather of the Constable, according to the author of the "*Cronica*." Don Juan had indeed rendered great assistance to Don Enrique in one of his bitterest straits; and, singularly enough, the successful bastard did not forget his obligations when fortune smiled upon him; nor does his gratitude appear even to have stopped with the immediate cause of its origin, for the children of don Juan Martinez were equally befriended by the new king, and promoted by him to posts of trust and importance. Don Alvaro de Luna, the father of the future Condestable, died when the latter was of a very early age, and he was under these circumstances brought up under the care of his uncle, named also don Juan Martinez de Luna. The author of the Chronicle gives a quaint account of his education, which it may be worth while to quote, as it conveys some notion of the state of public opinion upon such subjects in the days when this book was written. He says that—

"El Maestro é Condestable knew already, at the age of ten years, everything which ordinary children were then only beginning to learn.

He knew how to read and to write, *as became a gentleman*; he knew how to ride and to manage a horse; how to conduct fairly the business he undertook; and to be courteous in speech and well-behaved towards all around him; whereupon a tutor named Ramiro de Tamayo was appointed to teach the lad how to do everything which is consistent with the position of the descendant of a noble family."

Another uncle of the youthful don Alvaro, don Pedro de Luna, Archbishop of Toledo, took great notice of him in his early youth; and being greatly pressed by his nephew to introduce him to the court of the King of Castille, he secured his admission thereto about the year 1408, during the latter years of the reign of Don Juan II., just at the period when the Infante don Fernando of Arragon drove from the court Juan de Velasco and Diego Lopez Destuñiga, the councillors of the king. After a short residence at the court, don Alvaro de Luna appears to have attracted the attention of the feeble monarch, who named him one of his pages; and from that period his history became so interwoven with that of Don Juan II., that it is impossible to separate them; nay, so entirely had don Alvaro de Luna fascinated his weak-minded sovereign, that he could hardly exist without the presence of his favourite. About the year 1414, the kind uncle of don Alvaro, the Archbishop of Toledo died; but so far was this circumstance from interfering with the prospects of the nephew that the king shortly afterwards named him to the confidential post of Maestrasala.

Notwithstanding numerous intrigues, and some rather silly exhibitions of temper on the part of the young favourite himself, his influence seems to have continually increased; nor did the marriage of the king with his own cousin, the Infanta Doña Maria of Arragon, make any difference in the position of De Luna. An event which took place shortly after the marriage, indeed, placed the affection of the king towards his favourite in a stronger light than ever; for, upon don Alvaro's receiving a dangerous wound, in one of the fashionable tournaments of that age, his patron exhibited so much personal affection towards him, as to excite, to a greater extent than ever, the jealousy of his rivals. During the extraordinary scenes, which shortly afterwards took place in Castille, in consequence of the ambitious intrigues of Enrique de Navarre, Alvaro de Luna behaved with consummate skill, and enabled his master to escape from the power of his unprincipled relative. As a reward for the services so rendered, Don Juan created De Luna, "Condestable en los sus Regnos de Castilla é de Leon," about the year 1423, and treated him with the most unbounded trust and affection. The natural consequences followed from

this extraordinary favour; for some of the nobility began to conspire against the favourite, and in 1427, Alvaro de Luna was obliged, for the first time, to retire from the court to his town of Ayllon; from whence he was soon recalled by his attached sovereign, and by the majority of the nobles of Castille, who had become convinced, during his short absence, of his superiority to the ambitious but frivolous intriguers, who had temporarily succeeded in procuring his removal. During the very absurd wars which subsequently took place between the Kings of Arragon and Navarre on one side, and the King of Castille on the other—wars which, by the way, gave the Moors of Grenada a short interval of repose in their gradually declining fortunes—the new Condestable proved himself to be more than a match for his master's enemies; and after obtaining some decided advantages over them, he, at length, persuaded Don Juan to make peace, through the intervention of the King of Portugal, about the end of the year 1430; and having thus given tranquillity to the state, Alvaro de Luna, in 1431, married for the second time (his first wife, Elvira Portocarrero having died,) doña Juana Pimentel, daughter of the Conde de Benevente. As usually occurred upon the temporary conclusion of the civil wars of the Spaniards at this period, a vigorous attack was then made upon the Moors; but, though some sanguinary encounters took place, and many towns and villages were destroyed, no permanent injury appears to have been inflicted upon the infidels by the troops under the orders of don Alvaro, who is suspected of having made some culpable arrangement with them. About 1439, the civil wars broke out again; and the efforts of the discontented nobles were principally directed against the favourite; but the fortune of the Condestable was, after a temporary eclipse, still constant, and he defeated his rivals, or, as he called them, the enemies of his king, on several occasions. Nearly at this period also, or in 1445, the Infante don Enrique, who had been one of the most bitter enemies of De Luna, died in consequence of a wound received in the battle of Olmedo; and the king hastened to confer upon his friend and favourite the important office of the Mastership of the Order of Santiago, which had thus somewhat unexpectedly become vacant; and, shortly afterwards, Doña Maria, sister of the King of Arragon, and wife of the feeble Don Juan of Castille, died, not without exciting strong suspicions of unfair treatment from the Condestable, against whom she had taken a very violent part, in conjunction with the King of Navarre and don Enrique. The portion of De Luna's history between the years 1439 and 1445 is treated in a very unsatisfactory manner in the old Chronicle; and Mariana's

more classical work, equally with the curious sketch of Alvaro de Luna's life, given by Dupuy, in the "*Histoire des plus illustres Favoris, anciens et modernes*," published by Jean Elzevir, at Leyden, in 1661, or the "*Cronica del Rey Don Juan el Segundo*," (Madrid, 1678,) record the events of this troubled period in so confused a style, that it is extremely difficult to distinguish truth from falsehood, or even to follow the thread of events. Everything seemed, however, to smile upon the man whom the king delighted to honour, for a short time, until, intoxicated with success, he behaved with such tyrannical insolence, as to provoke a general combination of the nobility; and, at last, even to rouse the jealousy of the silly king himself. As usually happens in such cases, another minion was found ready to supplant the falling favourite, in the person of Alphonso Perez de Vivero, a former creature of De Luna's, who was anxious to divert to himself the affections of the king, which had been estranged from their former object by his overbearing and exacting character. Don Juan seems to have willingly lent himself to these intrigues, although, from the effects of long habit, the Condestable still retained an extraordinary hold upon his imagination; and for a long time his credit sufficed to prevent his rivals from obtaining any very decided advantage over him. But in the early part of the year 1453, the king, with the characteristic deceit and cruelty of a cowardly little mind, authorized Perez de Vivero to make some secret attempt against the life of his former friend. De Luna at first contented himself with unmasking these plots, and endeavouring to recover his position at court; but such slow measures either did not suit his temper, or they must have seemed to him unsuitable to his critical position, for he finally resolved to remove his great enemy De Vivero by assassination; and he actually put him to death, with the assistance of his relative Juan de Luna, and of his attached follower Fernando de Ribadeneyra, by throwing him off a tower.

The natural consequence of this violent proceeding was to increase the fear and dislike with which Don Juan now regarded his former favourite; and a long contest ensued. A kind of underhand intrigue was organized, for the purpose of inducing the Condestable to quit his feudal strongholds, and to intrust himself to the incensed, but deceitful monarch. For some time, De Luna declined to accept the invitation sent him to join the court, for he knew his man, and he observed that the safe-conducts given were so artfully worded as to leave room for any interpretation which might afterwards be put upon them, and had good reason to suspect, that the parties who surrounded the king were quite prepared to seize any opportunity for avenging the murder

of De Vivero. There was a struggle thus maintained between the former favourite and the new minions of his weak and cruel master, which lasted, with little credit to either party, until at length, wearied by these apparently interminable intrigues, De Luna gave himself up to the custody of Ruy Diaz, and to the Adelantado Perafan, and was at once thrown into prison. The faithful followers of the Condestable were equally made the objects of the royal treachery, and were punished in various manners, according to their position and influence; whilst Alvaro de Luna himself, without any regular trial, and in spite of the royal assurances, upon the faith of which he had surrendered, was beheaded near the monastery on the Plaza Mayor of Valladolid, on the 5th or 7th of June, 1453. In a very few days after this tragical end, Don Juan II. also died; as though the connexion between his reign and the prosperity of his early favourite had been destined to have been life-long.

The "*Chronica del Condestable Alvaro de Luna*" is a work which, in our opinion, is worthy of more attention than would be accorded to it, simply from a perusal of the introductory notice to the Madrid reprint of 1784. No doubt the style is very prolix; the moral reflections and the incidental exclamations of the author are very long; and the set speeches which he, from time to time, puts into the mouths of his characters, have a singularly affected and improbable character; but these defects may equally be urged against all the histories written after the model of Livy—to Machiavelli or De Thou, amongst others. It is equally certain, also, that the author of the Chronicle was an attached follower of the Condestable; and that he represents the origin of De Luna in a manner which contrasts very strikingly both with the account given by Dupuy in his sketch, and with that recorded in the "*Cronica del Rey Don Juan II.*" But we can find nothing in Mariana—the best authority we know upon this period of Spanish history—to make us reject entirely the account thus given by the faithful servant of the fallen favourite; and, indeed, the courage with which he records the praises of his deceased master, and calls down the reprobation of posterity on those who were directly or indirectly concerned in what he calls the murder of De Luna, induces us to attach unusual weight to his testimony. Prolix though the "*Cronica*" of the favourite be, it is sincere; and that quality covers a multitude of defects. Besides which, this tale has the recommendation, that it contains a very striking representation of a remarkable period in the history of one of the strangest nations of modern Europe, and of a peculiar phase in the development of the literature of that nation; for not only were the fortunes of Alvaro de Luna

worthy of notice, from their duration, and the apparently unaccountable nature of their decline,—but also the long series of official historical chronicles of the Spanish kings and of their ministers, presents an object of study such as we believe will hardly be met with in any other country. Many a lesson might be derived from these sources “to point a moral, or adorn a tale;” none would be more striking than that to be derived from the life and adventures of Alvaro de Luna—and this lesson, oddly enough, was conveyed by the friendly historian of the Condestable, when speaking of the death of his rival, De Vivero. It is pithily conveyed by the Spanish proverbs—“Quien mal anda, en mal acaba”—(he who follows evil ways will have a bad end); and, with reference to the habitual deceit of royal personages—“Una cosa piensa el bayo, e otra lo que el ensilla”—(the horse thinks one thing; he who saddles him, another).

There was something so romantic in the history of Alvaro de Luna, that it cannot be a matter of surprise that he should have attracted the attention of the contemporary poets. Thus we find that a considerable portion of the “Septima orden de Saturno,” of Juan de Mena’s celebrated “Labyrintho,” is devoted to the praises of the then powerful favourite (it was written in 1438, or thereabouts), and to the confident predictions of his success over the rival nobles and the Infantes, then arrayed against him. It requires a very strong effort of the will to master the language and the confused style of the (aptly called) “Labyrintho;” but there is more freshness about the eulogies of the Condestable than is to be found in the ordinarily exaggerated flattery bestowed by De Mena on his patrons. They do not, however, throw any light on the obscure questions of De Luna’s origin; nor do the copious notes with which the edition of “Las Trezcientas,” published at Alcala de Henares, in 1566, “is illustrated into obscurity,” add in any way to the stock of our information on the subject of his fate, fortunes, or character. But the notice by Jorge Manrique of the great enemy of his house is, perhaps, the most striking illustration of the impression produced upon men’s minds at this period by the rise and fall of the brilliant Condestable; and the “Glosas de Francisco de Guzman,” and of his coadjutors, supply many of the observations which might otherwise be considered wanting. Manrique devotes the whole of his twenty-first *copla* to an apostrophe to the fate of the “great Condestable and master, whom the world had seen so favoured; who yet had not ended his days without a public execution! nor were his infinite treasures, his castles or towns, other than sources of grief, and burdens when he quitted life.” As this is a rather free translation of the original,

because we have attempted to condense into it some explanation of the references to preceding parts of the poem, so we subjoin the passage itself in the original Spanish :—

“Pues aquel grand Condestable
Maestre que conoscimos
tan privado,
No cumple que del se hable
Sino solo que le vimos
Degollado.
Sus infinitas thesoros,
Sus villas y sus lugares,
y mandar ;
¿ que le fueron sino lloros ?
¿ fueronle sino pesares
al dexar ? ”

And we add Longfellow's translation, which conveys tolerably the meaning and the general melancholy tone of the old Spaniard, whose pity for the fallen Condestable was, we may observe in passing, the more creditable, insomuch as Manrique's father had been one of the most active and uncompromising of the unsuccessful enemies of De Luna in his earlier days. Longfellow, however, renders the *copla* we have above quoted in this wise, with all a translator's license :—

“Spain's haughty Constable,—the true
And gallant master,—whom we knew
Most loved of all,—
Breathe not a whisper of his pride ;
He on the gloomy scaffold died—
Ignoble fall !

“The countless treasures of his care,
His hamlets green, and cities fair,
His mighty power ;—
What were they all but grief and shame,
Tears and a broken heart, when came
The parting hour ! ”

Longfellow praises in the most decided manner the Glosa of “El Padre D. Rodrigo de Valdepeñas, Religioso de la Cartuja,” and, perhaps, it is the best of the four productions of that description given in Sancha's reprint of 1779 ; but, after all, there is something essentially impertinent in the whole system upon which these Glosa are founded, and they remind us precisely of those abominations music-masters so delight to honour, known by the name of “airs with variations.” We do not believe that Glosa exist as a recognized class of literature in any language of Europe but in the Spanish ; nor do we believe

that any other nation would tolerate such ingenious trifling. The existence, however, of so many Glosa upon Manrique's poem, proves the importance his countrymen attach to it; and, although it may not be worth our while to quote them here, we think that the student of Spanish history and of Spanish poetry, would do well to study the commentaries by Guzman, Valdepeñas, Perez, and Alonso Cervantes.

The next personage of the strange drama of Spanish history and intrigue, to whom we propose to call attention, Antonio Perez, was a man of far more humble origin than either of the other characters before-mentioned; but, perhaps, the influence he exercised upon the fate of his native country surpassed that of the royal rebel, or of the life-long favourite. Don Juan Manuel and Alvaro de Luna, indeed, played very conspicuous parts upon the stage during the feudal period; but they were both essentially of their age, and they neither understood, nor sought to raise, great social or constitutional problems. They fought for power and influence; but they only believed in the validity of the strong will and of the iron hand. In the case of Antonio Perez, however, a great constitutional question was raised, and though he himself was utterly unworthy of the interest he excited, the singular manner in which his fortunes were connected with the destruction of the independent liberties of the Arragonese, and the remarkable favour with which this unprincipled exile was at first received by Henry IV., Elizabeth, Sully, and Essex, must at all times make him an object of surpassing interest to those who endeavour to discover the obscure workings of society at the wonderful period when it passed decidedly from the influence of mediævalism to its modern type; and when, in the midst of its apparent triumphs, the seeds of destruction were sown broadcast over that Spanish power, which, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, had bidden fair to absorb Europe.

Antonio Perez, as we learn from the third part of his memorial, and from M. Mignet's charming history, was the son of Gonzalo Perez, who had been secretary of state under Charles V. Antonio, at a very early age, entered the service of Phelippe II., and for some time he was highly favoured by that singular monarch, being employed by him as a confidential secretary. About the year 1577 some extraordinary events took place in the Spanish court, which have not been explained by any of the publications of the period, or by more modern researches; but it would appear that Phelippe made use of the unscrupulous Antonio Perez to assassinate Juan de Escovedo, the confidential adviser of the brave but restless and imprudent bastard brother of the king, don Juan of Austria. Watson, in

his "History of Philip II.," states that Escovedo, who had, at one time, been the personal friend of Perez, had discovered an intrigue carried on between the latter and the Princesse d'Eboli, widow of Gomez de Silva, one of the king's greatest favourites; for, bigoted as he was, he at all times indulged in gallantry. Escovedo seems to have revealed this discovery to the royal lover, and, with his characteristic treachery and cruelty, the latter resolved to rid himself of both objects of his bitter enmity by playing them off one against the other. Perez received from the king written instructions (which he afterwards published in the various "Relaciones" and "Memoriales" printed after his escape into France,) to murder Escovedo, of whose influence over don Juan, Phelippe was extremely jealous. Although the king had given Perez every assurance of immunity for this equivocal act, and for some time avoided any public exhibition of his real intentions, he shortly afterwards authorized the widow and children of Escovedo to commence an action against the murderer of their relative; and he personally ordered—if, indeed, he did not personally superintend—the arrest of both Perez and of the Princesse d'Eboli on this charge. Sad and contemptible as Phelippe's behaviour was in this instance, when we consider only his complicity in a crime, and his cowardly treachery towards his fellow-murderers, the palace revolution effected by the removal of Perez and of the Princesse d'Eboli had a singular influence upon the politics of Spain, then the most powerful and wealthiest nation of Europe; and, as M. Mignet well observes, the transfer of power which then took place from the able politicians who had been trained in the moderate doctrines of the latter days of Charles V., to Cardinal Granvella and the ultra-Romanist party, led shortly to the adoption of the system which conduced ultimately to the independence of the Dutch provinces; to the long, bitter, and disgraceful war against our Elizabeth; to the invasion of Portugal; and to the fatal intrigues of the League in France.

For his own private reasons Phelippe did not allow the accusations against Perez, on the score of the murder of Escovedo, to be then proceeded with; and, after detaining him in prison for eight months, he allowed him to enjoy a species of liberty under the superintendence of the police. But the king was not disposed thus to allow his enemy to escape; and, after a very short delay, he caused an inquiry to be made into his conduct in the management of the public moneys of his department. This was, naturally enough in such a court, followed by a conviction of the disgraced favourite on a charge of peculation, and by the promulgation of a very violent sentence of pains and penalties. As though Perez had been destined to prove the

inefficacy of all the constitutional guarantees for the liberty of the subject in Spain, he sought refuge at first under the protection of the Cardinal of Toledo, in the church of St. Justo of Madrid; but the alcades violated the sanctuary, and the king so frightened the judges of the ecclesiastical courts, that they did not dare to maintain the right of asylum of which the church had been hitherto so jealous. Perez was then closely confined, and both he and his wife—a model of a faithful, attached woman, whose name, Juana Coëllo, ought to be handed down with blessings to posterity, and whose conduct throws great doubts upon the tale of Perez's relations with the Princesse d'Eboli—were subjected to mental and bodily torture, until they consented to give up to the cowardly and vindictive king the papers which proved his connexion with the murder of Escovedo. For a few weeks after this delivery, the captivity of Perez was rendered less irksome; but directly the king fancied that he was secure against any revelations, he allowed the heirs of Escovedo to recommence their pursuit against the ostensible murderer, and he even urged on the proceedings by all the means in his power. So determined, indeed, was Phelippe to get rid of Perez, that even when the latter had contrived to arrange the claim of the son of Escovedo—had purchased, in fact, his silence, by the payment of a large sum of money—the king pursued his former accomplice even more bitterly than ever, and at length exposed him to the awful punishment of torture. Overcome by pain, Perez then at last avowed his participation in the murder, but in such terms as to bring home to the king his share of the crime; and thus an almost universal feeling was excited in favour of the victim of the royal treachery, which materially served him in the future scenes of his strange drama. Perez was convinced, however, that no considerations of justice or honour would be allowed to intervene between himself and the king's vengeance; so, by the aid of the bold, active, and attached Juana Coëllo, notwithstanding that she was then near her confinement, he escaped into the kingdom of Arragon, which still retained many of its ancient privileges or *fueros*, and boasted a degree of constitutional liberty unknown in Castille or the other kingdoms of the Peninsula. In this favoured country all legal proceedings were transacted publicly, and the conduct of the king, or of his ministers, was canvassed as freely as that of the humblest person accused; and Perez knew that, by divulging the whole truth of the dark deeds of which he was accused, and in which he had unfortunately meddled, he would be able to throw a fair share of the blame upon the proper parties, even if he could not excuse himself. The sombre tyrant, too, felt all this; and in the first burst of his rage at

the escape of his victim, he wreaked his vengeance upon the innocent wife and children of the latter with a refinement of barbarism worthy of the representative of the Jesuitical Catholicism of the latter end of the sixteenth century. Perez's escape into Arragon took place in the month of April, 1591.

In the third chapter of Ranke's "Historical Treatise upon the Spanish Empire," will be found a very interesting account of the peculiar constitution of Arragon, which rendered it, in fact, "a republic, detached and shut up within itself, having at its head a king, but a king with very limited prerogatives." The reader who may be desirous of becoming acquainted with this extraordinary state of things, is referred to the author we have above quoted, or to those from whom he obtained his information, especially Geronymo Martel, Blancas, and Blasco de la Nuza, and to Mignet's admirable history of Antonio Perez. For our purpose, at present, it may suffice to observe that the Arragonese were especially careful of the independence of their administration of justice. Even the saintly Isabella had been annoyed by the interferences thus created with her prerogative; but neither she nor her husband, nor Carlos V. in the plenitude of his power, had either dared, or deemed it advisable, to interfere with the administration of justice in Arragon. Philippe II. had, indeed, established some royal tribunals; for, like all tyrants, he was an instinctive admirer of administrative centralization; but these courts were still subordinate to the indigenous tribunals, and they had a very limited authority. The most important of the superior local institutions was the Justicia Mayor, an officer of such power that, according to Argensola, he was able to control and examine the acts of the king himself. The Justicia Mayor was, indeed, named by the king, but he could only be removed by the decision of the Cortes, who, on the other hand, were entitled to dismiss him if he neglected to defend the privileges of the kingdom of Arragon or allowed the administration of justice to be tampered with by the royal servants. Any inhabitant of Arragon could appeal to his court; and, thereupon, all proceedings before the inferior tribunals at once ceased; even if they had passed sentence, its execution was suspended, and the Justicia Mayor was bound to reverse any decision which was contrary to the "*Fueros y observaciones del reyno de Arragon*." Directly, therefore, Perez touched the soil of Arragon, he threw himself under the protection of this organization, by claiming the privilege of the "*Manifestados*;" whilst the agent of the royal power endeavoured by force to remove him from the monastery in which he had taken refuge, and to restore him to the legal authorities of Castille, where, of course, his fate would have been at once sealed.

Before, however, Phelippe's agent had secured the person of the unfortunate secretary, don Juan de Luna, one of the deputies of the kingdom (how oddly these names recur!), arrived with the guard of the Justicia, and he escorted Perez to Saragossa, where he was safely lodged in the prison of the Fuero. The king then brought an accusation, in form, against Perez: first, for having murdered Escovedo, and improperly used the king's name in the matter; secondly, for having been a traitor to the king by divulging the secrets of the case, and altering official documents; and, thirdly, for having fled from justice. These accusations were urged vehemently, and with all the weight of the royal authority, by don Inigo de Mendoza, the representative of Phelippe in Saragossa; and, in self-defence, Perez addressed to the Justicia a document, which M. Mignet truly calls "celebrated,"—"the memorial which Antonio Perez presented of the facts of his case, brought before the Tribunal (so called) of the Justice of Arragon by the king as complainant." It is a very long and a very able justification of his own conduct, according to the principles and modes of reasoning admitted in Spain during the sixteenth century; and though, undoubtedly, Perez herein avows in the most open and unreserved manner his participation in the treacheries and crimes which resulted in the murder of Escovedo, he proved beyond the possibility of denial, by the king's own written instructions, that no steps had been taken in the matter without his entire knowledge and free consent, or without his direct orders. If Perez were to blame, what could be said of the king who could coolly order the crime, and then seek to torture and judicially murder his own tools? So foul, indeed, did the case of the monarch appear even to his advisers, that the accusation on the score of Escovedo's murder was withdrawn; and the Justicia thereupon acquitted Perez. A second accusation was brought against him within five days from this acquittal, for having made away with some of the minor agents of the original crime; but he triumphantly proved his innocence, and that his asserted victims had died by natural means. The king, again defeated, now endeavoured to reach Perez by a species of administrative inquiry, which would have withdrawn the affair from the cognizance of the ordinary tribunals, and he required the Justicia to yield the former secretary to the royal agent in Saragossa, in order that he might be tried for corruption and peculation in the discharge of his duties as secretary. Fortunately for Perez, amongst his other means of defence, he could plead that the king was only entitled to exercise this irresponsible power over his servants in Arragon on the condition of their having been employed in that particular kingdom; and, as he had served

the king in Castille, he could not be proceeded against in this manner. This attempt to secure his victim, therefore, was defeated; but Phelippe was not disposed so easily to be baulked of his vengeance, and, as a last resource, he set that awful mystery of iniquity, the Inquisition, in motion against the unfortunate secretary. In some of the moments of despair, caused by the shameful and bitter persecutions to which he had been exposed, probably Perez may have used expressions which would have brought him within the pale of this anomalous tribunal; but the accusation brought against him appears from the less generally known history of his life, written by himself, entitled, "*Relacion Summaria que yua haziendo Raphael Peregrino, del discurso de las prisiones y aventuras de Antonio Perez, &c.*," published at Lyon, without date, and dedicated to our Lord Essex, probably about the year 1594, to have been principally founded upon the desire he had expressed to retire into Béarn, Holland, or France; and, indeed, the accusation was so trivial, that in public opinion it passed simply for what it was, namely, an excuse for withdrawing Perez from every description of legal or constitutional tribunal. Especially jealous as the Arragonese were of their *fueros*, they had always looked upon the Inquisition with horror, and had resisted, as far as was in their power, its establishment. At this precise time, also (1591), the evident servility with which the Holy Office lent itself to the conspiracy against the persecuted secretary, raised a strong feeling in his favour, and it created such an irritation in the public mind against the royal tyrant, as at length burst forth in open war—a war which enabled Perez, it is true, to escape, but which terminated in the destruction of the *fueros* of Arragon, because the nobles proved traitors to the cause of their country and its laws.

The affair, however, passed in this wise. An order was sent from the superior tribunal of the Inquisition, to the inferior local branch at Saragossa to proceed against Antonio Perez, and Mayorini (an attached follower who had long shared his master's fate, and had, therefore, been exalted to the position of an object of the king's personal enmity), on the accusation of heresy. At first, the minor officers of the Justicia refused to yield the persons of the accused who had "manifested;" but the Justicia Mayor, himself, having been gained to the king's views, issued an order by which the prisoners were handed over to the familiars of the Inquisition, and by them transferred to the dungeons of the old Moorish palace of the Aljaferia. Antonio Perez had warm friends in the Cortes of Arragon, and they attempted, before proceeding to violent measures, to induce the

Justicia Mayor to reverse his decision, and to maintain the rights and liberties of his fellow-citizens. Finding, however, that he was determined not to interpose between the king and his intended victim, about whose fate, so far as it depended upon the will of the monarch, there could no longer be any doubt, the friends of Perez passed at once into the marketplace, and by the cry, so potent with the Saragossans, of "*Contra fuero! Viva la libertad, y ayuda a la libertad!*" they raised a serious insurrection. The marquis of Almenara, the king's commissioner, was seized by the infuriated populace as the principal agent in the oppression of Perez, and though he was rescued from their hands by some gentlemen, it was only after receiving some wounds, of which he shortly afterwards died. The Justicia Mayor himself was ill-treated, and trodden under foot by the mob, who bitterly reproached him with his cowardice; and so high did the tumult rise, that the Viceroy don Jaime Vimeny, and the Archbishop of Saragossa, Bobadilla, were obliged to interfere with the members of the Holy Tribunal, to obtain from them that Perez and Mayorini should be transferred back again to the "*carcel de los Manifestados*;" or, in other words, replaced under the protection of the *fueros* of Arragon.

Philippe II. was not a man likely to accept a defeat from a popular insurrection, but the difficulties of his political position at the precise moment of Perez's escape, were such that he was forced to adopt indirect measures for the attainment of his cherished object of removing the depositary of his secrets. There ensued a long and dark struggle between the Inquisition, supported by the royal power on one side, and the tribunals entrusted with the defence of the *fueros* of Arragon on the other, the result of which would seem to have been that the local authorities were at last persuaded to abandon their independence in all matters of fact, provided that they could save appearances. Perez was of course made the scapegoat, and was handed over in due legal form to the alguazil of the Inquisition; but, fortunately for him, his friend Gil de Mesa was able to raise such a popular tumult, that again the royal troops were dispersed, and the intended victim of the king's treachery escaped,—this time, to the mountains, from whence, after a time, he passed to the court of Henri of Navarre at Béarn. The Arragonese were not, however, so fortunate; for the king assembled a large body of Castilian troops, and, after a short and feeble resistance, he obtained possession of Saragossa, making prisoners of the leading nobility who had in any wise supported the cause of local independence. A fierce and bloody persecution followed this occupation; and, in the name

of religion, an *auto da fé* took place, on October 20th, 1592, in which seventy-nine unfortunate victims of royal and priestly revenge suffered, and in which Perez was burnt in effigy. The ancient liberties of Arragon were forcibly set aside; and thus the tumults which had secured the personal safety of the ex-secretary, finally resulted in the destruction of the Arragonese independence, and the extension of the degrading despotism of the court and of the cloister, under whose influence Spain so soon, and so miserably, lost its former proud position in the foremost rank of European nations. During the minority of Carlos V., the Cardinal Ximenes had already taken advantage of the defeat of the *comuneros* to destroy the local privileges of the Castellians; and now, in 1592, the son of Carlos availed himself gladly of the pretext afforded by the interposition of the mob of Saragossa between himself and the object of his personal enmity, to deprive the whole kingdom of Arragon of its privileges. Unfortunately, public opinion in those days was not sufficiently alive to the evils attending the excessive development of the central government, to secure an efficient defence of the privileges of the various portions of the large European kingdoms; and Spain was not alone in the tame abandonment of the formerly cherished privileges of its provinces. At the close of the Middle Ages, indeed, a great movement seems to have pervaded all European nations, tending to the constitution of united and centralized governments. Spain fell under its influence even before its neighbours; and it may be, that the personal character of the Spanish monarchs contributed much to this result. But, be this as it may, the outbreaks of the population of Saragossa afforded Phelippe II. the opportunity he so long had sought for, in order to destroy the troublesome *fueros* of Arragon; and the popular resistance to a monstrous act of injustice and iniquity furnished the sombre tyrant with an excuse for the removal of the only existing barriers to his arbitrary authority which still existed in the Peninsula.

Antonio Perez, the indirect cause of this sad termination of the long-cherished liberties of the Arragonese, seems, after his escape from the dominions of his persecutor, to have acted upon other scenes the same character of an unwilling Marplot, or at least to have been unscrupulously used by that very equivocal gentleman Henri Quatre, in his negotiations with our Elizabeth, and with Phelippe. At first, Perez was received with open arms by the Béarnais, and was sent with a special letter of introduction to the English court. There he naturally connected himself with the Earl of Essex, and the party who were disposed, in opposition to Burleigh's advice, to act energetically

against the Spanish monarch; and the discarded secretary (if we may judge by his correspondence, both Latin and Spanish, and by the letters of the spies of the Spanish court, recently brought to light,) no doubt exercised great influence upon the conduct of the favourite of the vain old queen. He published, about this time, under the protection of his foreign patrons, several full accounts of the events connected with his own wild and adventurous life; and by thus holding up the Spanish monarch to the reprobation of honest men in all civilized nations, he contributed greatly to destroy the *prestige* Phelippe had acquired as the champion of the Roman Catholic church. But Perez himself was utterly devoid of moral worth; and during the singular diplomatic contest which took place between the Catholic and Protestant interests of Western Europe about the end of the sixteenth and the commencement of the seventeenth century, he endeavoured — *per fas et nefas* — to make himself necessary to both parties, sometimes doing the biddings of Henri IV., and sometimes those of the Earl of Essex, but at all times striving to make himself necessary, although he did not scruple to play falsely with both England and France. The natural consequences of this duplicity were, that both governments used Perez so long as they required his services; when they wanted him no longer, he was without ceremony cast aside. Henri IV., after the peace of Vervins, in 1598, did so without scruple—as, indeed, was his wont with any of the tools for whom he had no further need. The English government had passed, by this time, from the hands of Elizabeth and of Essex, to those of James I. and of Robert Cecil, who were little disposed to look with favour upon the man whose main object in life, since his escape from Spain, had been to urge on the allies, England, France, and the Seven Provinces, in their war against the Spanish monarch. Phelippe II., too, had died in 1598, and had thus removed the great obstacle to the establishment of a peace between England and Spain, the negotiations for which were commenced in 1604; and Perez, having resigned the pension he so irregularly received from the unscrupulous Béarnais, in order that he might voluntarily place himself in a position to be able to serve the interests of the new king, Phelippe III., at the English court, found himself the dupe of his own double-dealing. His heroic wife, Juana Coëlle, had been treated, however, in her native land, with far more consideration, by the kind intervention of the new favourite, the Duke de Lerma; and her suit for the revocation of her husband's condemnation, as well as her action against his arch enemy Rodrigo Vasquez de Arce, were supported by the weight and influence of the crown. But, during the latter years of his

life, Perez seems, like a detected impostor, to have passed his time in useless attempts to obtain the renewal of his pension from the French court, or his recall to his native land. He lingered through his last few years in poverty and misery of the most humiliating description, until at last, on November 3, 1611, he closed his agitated career under very painful and abject conditions, leaving to posterity a striking illustration of the moral law, that the agents of the crimes of kings are tolerably certain to be made to bear the punishment awarded by Providence in this life to their own, and to their employers' crimes; and that even, in its narrowest and most worldly sense, the maxim is true that "Honesty is the best policy." Perez was, in fact, an unscrupulous agent of anybody, who would pay for his services, or gratify his passions. He had, as we said before, no moral worth, and only enlists our sympathies because it was sought to make him the scapegoat of greater and more powerful villains. For his own sake he would have been hardly worthy of notice; and he was temporarily converted into an object of universal interest, because his cause, in the main, had become identified with that of the liberties of an ancient and noble race. Unfortunately, these fell with him; and it must ever be a cause of regret that such a man should have been so able to imperil and shipwreck the liberties and the happiness of countless generations—for we hold that the prevalence of the spirit of centralization, which was the real result of the suppression of the Arragonese *fueros*, has been the greatest source of evil to Spain, as it is to all other countries. How inscrutable are the ways of Providence! and how ought we to learn reverently to bow to its decrees when we find that our open efforts cannot alter the course of events! What a mystery it is that the happiness of a nation should have been thus sacrificed in the cause of an unprincipled villain! How vain were all his and his friends' attempts to stem the course of events by their petty intrigues in foreign courts! And, lastly, we cannot refrain from asking what is to be the sequel of all these strange eventful histories of Spain's annals, of which the lives of Juan Manuel, Alvaro de Luna, and Antonio Perez are but casual illustrations?

We have had occasion in the course of our notice of the adventures of Perez, to speak highly of Mignet's work, cited at the head of this article; and we feel that it would be but a useless labour to attempt a detailed investigation of its merits. That author's work is, indeed, a model of painstaking attention and conscientious investigation into the documents which his official position has enabled him to consult; and, as a specimen of scholarship and of style, it may challenge comparison with

the productions of any of the other brilliant historians who have lately done such honour to France. Perez's own literary compositions are, naturally enough, of far less artistic value; for he who was so earnestly and so bitterly engaged in the struggle for dear life, could hardly have leisure to court the Muses. Yet his Latin and Spanish letters have very considerable merit. The "Memoriales" and "Relaciones" are masterpieces of polemical writing, when the character of the age is considered; and in the "Aphorismos," selected by Perez himself from the main body of his writings, will be found the germ of many of the maxims embodied by subsequent writers into their more ambitious essays on morals. De la Rochefoucauld, especially, seems to have used the Spaniard without scruple, and without acknowledgment, as his own countryman, Amelot de la Housaye, very clearly proves. No doubt the Latin of Perez's letters is very funny stuff, and evidently it has suffered from the influence of the false taste introduced by Justus Lipsius, to whom, indeed, the last letter of the collection is addressed. In the Spanish letters, too, there are many things in the style and wording to puzzle a modern reader who has not devoted some attention to the development of the Spanish language; still more are there to excite the astonishment of an Englishman at the present day in the abject tone in which even the crimes of kings are spoken of, the servility of the victim, and the utter absence of moral dignity in the highest performers on the world's stage at the close of the transition period between mediævalism and modern times. There is a wordy diffuseness about the discussions of minor points, and a clear, sharp decision of expression upon matters of greater moment, which startle and perplex the ordinary reader, who can at the present day with difficulty form any distinct conception of the solemn trifling which the wisest and best of our ancestors admitted in their gravest disputes. But, after all, there are few Spanish books, of the period alluded to, so calculated to lay bare the secrets of statecraft, or to display the real characters of many of the leaders in either Spanish, French, or English history. Perez, indeed, was in correspondence, and almost on terms of intimacy, with Essex and Bacon in our country; with Henri IV. and Sully in France, though the two latter appear to have soon seen through him; and, of course, with all the great men of the Spanish court during the period of his favour. A selection and translation of his letters would, we believe, afford considerable interest to the historical student—unless, indeed, the superior merits of M. Mignet's charming production should determine a preference in its favour—but, alas! we fear that it would not improve our opinions of human nature, or our respect

for the leaders of society. The kind and affectionate letters to his wife and children are indeed the most relieving portions of these pictures of the statesman's heart of hearts, as it had been rendered by the education and morals of the Spanish court at the close of the sixteenth century.

A few of Perez's aphorisms are subjoined as illustrations of his turn of mind, and of the character of his age:—

"The only perfect friendship is that between the soul and the body, which are indissolubly partners in the loss or gain they may achieve."

"The tongue is the most unfaithful witness of the heart."

"Work uses up the mind and the soul, as old age uses up the body."

"It is a fatal sign when a prince refuses advice."

"Want of confidence and suspicion are like the poisons of medicine: when small quantities are given with prudence, they purge; when too much is given, they kill."

"To point out objections, and to suggest the remedy for them, is the part of great minds; not to suggest the remedy, is the part of irresolute ones."

"Kings speak very kindly to their servants when they require any great service of them."

"Past services are like old debts, which are seldom paid."

"They who naturally practise virtue, seek no reward."

"Possession is the period of the destruction of illusions."

"Fortune is most to be feared when she appears most certain."

"Successful or unsuccessful love are equally causes of melancholy."

"True love increases with absence."

"He who loses will soon lose his judgment."

"Familiar letters display the real character more faithfully than the features of the countenance."

"The pen is a sixth sense given to the absent, to compensate for their not being able to use the other five."

"Without confidence life could not exist."

"France and Spain, the balance of Europe; England, the needle."

"Memory is a true mirror to enable us to know and correct our private defects."

"It is a great error to grieve for that which cannot be remedied."

"Experience points the rules of every art."

"An innocent man is a standing reproach to his persecutor."

"Curiosity is more often inspired by hatred than by love."

"Hope is the *viaticum* of human life, and the feeling which is the most easily played upon."

"Carelessness is the best cosmetic of true beauty."

"One man cannot deceive all the world, any more than all the world will combine to deceive one man."

"Elevated positions honour some men, are the recompense of others, and display their real merits."

"The knowledge of courts is like surgery ; which, in its speculative branch, only teaches the wounds of others, or of ourselves."

"Public opinion is the only tribunal before which kings can be cited."

These maxims, it may be observed, are devoid of the point and elegance of De la Rochefoucauld's more laboured productions, and they have as little true religious feeling as those of the old Frondeur. Their style and language is often cramped and affected, and they are strongly marked by the false taste of the age ; but, at the same time, they are, in the main, correct expressions of the opinions and principles of those with whom Perez was principally in contact, and they furnish a curious illustration of the state of society as it then existed amongst the rulers of mankind. The singular adventures of Perez have impressed a peculiar character of melancholy over his reflections, and it would be difficult to find a more pointed satire upon courts than may be gathered from their general tenor. Mankind, however, seems but little disposed to profit by the lessons conveyed by the writings of disappointed and undeceived gamblers in the great lottery of life ; and it is more than questionable whether the bitter experience of Perez ever deterred an ambitious student from attempting to scale the dizzy heights of fame and power, or from exposing himself to royal or popular ingratitude. In these matters wisdom cries her lessons in the streets in vain, and perhaps it is as well for the benefit of our race that it should still be so. But certainly the recent events of Spanish history prove that the nation has derived little benefit from the experience of the past, and that the various episodes of her former distinguished characters may still be re-enacted. Unfortunately, the present race of adventurers who dispute the possession of power and favour, only resemble their predecessors in their absence of moral principle ; their lives have not been so dramatic, nor have their literary productions been as interesting as those of Juan Manuel de Luna, or Perez : and so we are more and more compelled, if we would think well of Spain, to turn from her overclouded present to her brilliant and chivalrous past.

ART. II.—THE BERLIN ACADEMY.

Histoire Philosophique de l'Académie de Prusse depuis Leibnitz jusqu'à Schelling, particulièrement sous Frédéric le Grand. Par Christian Bartholmèss. 2 Vols., 8vo. Paris: Meyrueis.

It is with feelings of sadness that we sit down to a task which otherwise would have been for us such a source of unmixed gratification. Worn out by intense application to his duties as a lecturer,* M. Bartholmèss had been compelled in the course of last summer to repair to Carlsbad for the benefit of the mineral waters;—but what is relaxation for a man whose every moment is spent in the company of books and the abstraction of metaphysical research? The evil was done,—the blow had been struck at the tree. On his return home M. Bartholmèss died almost suddenly at Nuremberg, at the early age of forty-one, leaving, as a scholar, a writer, and a Christian, a name which is treasured up in the hearts of all those who had the pleasure of being acquainted with him.

Amongst the various works composed by our friend, the one we now purpose reviewing is not the least interesting. The annals of the Academy of Prussia deserve notice for more than one reason. Besides containing the record of labours which have added largely to our store of scientific knowledge, developed æsthetic taste, and elucidated many points in the often intricate paths of moral philosophy, they are closely connected with the history of Continental Protestantism. The list of the *savants* whose debates occupied the leisure time of Frederick the Great, and enlivened the after-dinner *réunions* at Potsdam, includes the names of many of those confessors of the faith, whom the persecutions of Louis XIV. and of Father La Chaise drove away from France, at the time when, intoxicated by flattery and power, a misguided monarch was induced to revoke the Edict of Nantes. In his interesting “History of the French Protestant Refugees,” M. Weiss remarks that “the French officers taken prisoners at the battle of Rosbach were greatly struck, not only at meeting, in the land of their captivity, with a multitude of their countrymen proceeding from every part of France, but also at finding their language in almost general use in all the provinces of the Prussian monarchy, even amongst the natives. Everywhere they fell in with numerous descendants of the refugees applying themselves to the cultivation of letters and arts; setting an example of gravity and morality; and preserving, in the midst

* At the Protestant college of Strasburg.

of a society which began to be led away by the incredulous spirit of the age, an unshaken attachment to the religious convictions of their ancestors."*

The above quotation may help to refute a statement which has often been put forth under the sanction of writers whose *dicta* are thought, and in most cases justly so, to be without appeal. The Berlin Academy, some say, was the accomplice of Frederick the Great in his work of destruction: it was a pale copy of the infidel Paris drawing-rooms. The unchristian doctrines preached by Voltaire, the materialism expounded at Baron d'Holbach's *petits soupers*, or in the *salon* of Madame du Deffand, had found in the members of an audacious Prussian clique, advocates and proselytes. Such is the assertion of M. de Lamartine;† M. de Châteaubriand‡ utters the same complaint, and Charles de Villers himself,§ without the slightest ground for doing so, applies to the whole Academy indiscriminately, the contemptuous epithet—*minions* of Frederick!

It is rather curious, however, that if these statements are true, the modern German philosophers should have been justified in finding fault with the Berlin Academy for precisely opposite reasons. "The Berlin Academy!" our transcendental friends exclaim: "The Berlin Academy! they were only clumsy courtiers, for their opinions were diametrically contrary to those of the king and of his friends; they were honest spiritualists, scrupulous and reasonable observers, faithful and wise analysts of human nature; but did they ever possess (note the Hegelian jargon) a sovereign synthesis, an infallible method, a universal formula? No; in their discussions, in their writings, you find nothing transcendent, nothing speculative, nothing absolute!"

Such are the two complaints uttered against the *Académie de Prusse*—complaints so utterly incompatible with one another, that they must have sprung from either ignorance or prejudice. In fact, the name of Frederick the Great acting as a sort of scarecrow upon some, they sweep away under one common censure all the unfortunate persons who have had anything to do with the *Philosophe de Sans Souci*; whilst the others are not less ready to hurl their metaphysical thunderbolts at the much-to-be-pitied wights, who either do not know Hegel's doctrines, or knowing, refuse to endorse them.

Here, as in most cases, the truth lies midway; and in his work, M. Bartholmèss has proved that the influence of the

* M. Weiss,—M. Hardman's Translation, p. 154.

† Histoire des Girondins, I. pp. 314, 347.

‡ Mémoires d'Outre Tombe, I., vii.

§ Philosophie de Kant, pref. p. xvii.

Prussian Academy, far from being on the side of atheism and materialism, was nearly similar to that which characterized the school of Scottish philosophers towards the end of the last century.

"If," says our author, "Hutcheson, Smith, Reid, Dugald Stewart, struggle against the disastrous consequences of Locke's system, against the mysticism of Bishop Berkeley, the pyrrhonism of Hume, the fatalism advocated by Hartley or Priestley; we see, on the other hand, men such as Béguelin, Šulzer, Lambert, Mérian, Ancillon, attacking the mathematical formalism of Wolf, the idealistic scepticism of Kant, but, above all, the materialism of the French *encyclopédistes*, and their dangerous apostolate. The method followed by the Prussian Academicians, their views, their conclusions, are, with a few exceptions, the same as those we find in the universities of Scotland. In both cases, it is by the help of experience that the philosopher hopes to know man and his relations with God and with the world; in both cases it is by the practice of justice and of virtue that he believes he may attain to human wisdom and to human happiness. The noble and solid piety, the strong and wholesome morality, which Leibnitz, the founder of the Prussian Academy, had recommended, and which the Scotch metaphysicians considered likewise as the last and best result of their works—these were the safeguards which kept both schools of thinkers equally distant from the licentious paradoxes then fashionable, and from old prejudices long since discarded by all well-balanced minds."—Pref. iv., v.

The work of M. Bartholmèss is composed of two distinct parts, each of which we shall briefly notice. How did the Academy of Berlin originate? who was its founder? through what stages of development did it pass? what were its relations with the various monarchs who ruled over the destinies of Prussia? Such are the first questions which we must endeavour to answer. It may be said, then, that the Prussian institute sprung with the Prussian monarchy itself. In the year 1701, Sophia-Charlotte, Electress of Brandenburg, aided by no less a man than the celebrated Leibnitz, founded at Berlin the *Académie des Sciences et des Lettres*; one year after, the Elector Frederick III. ascended the throne, under the title of Frederick I. Such coincidences are remarkable in the annals of literary societies, and it is a good omen when founders of states and rulers of empires show that they consider the graces of literature as the brightest ornaments of their crown. How few gymnasia or other associations for the improvement of learning, have had the benefit of being organized by men of the reputation which Leibnitz then enjoyed? Richelieu, we know, founded the *Académie Française*, and Napoleon remodelled the *Institute National*; but the object of both these great men was clearly to

bring the powers of the mind itself under the authority of their uncompromising despotism, and the interests of intellectual progress were only with them of secondary moment.

The Academy of Berlin finally constituted and provided with a definite code of laws under the reign of the first Prussian monarch, was, nevertheless, the offspring of the father of Frederick I., the Grand-Elector Frederick-William. By the generous liberality with which he opened his states to the Huguenot refugees, whom the blind tyranny of Louis XIV. had driven away from their native land—by the encouragement which he constantly gave to all the arts of civilization—that illustrious prince is in some sense entitled to the honour of having laid the first foundations of the *corps savant* whose history we are now examining. Before the tide of immigration had set in, and the persecution on the French side of the Rhine had become excessive, the Elector Frederick-William was already busy about a scheme for establishing in his dominions a literary society somewhat similar to those which existed in Italy, in France, and in England. But, led away by his enthusiasm, he had intended organizing that society according to a plan which M. Bartholmèss is perfectly justified in calling *un peu chimérique*. Instead of a mere company, the Elector wished to establish a whole city of *savants*; he would outdo the “New Atlantis,” improve upon Sir Thomas More’s “Utopia,” and bring to perfection Tycho Brahe’s model town of “Uraniburg.” Let our readers only just fancy what that *imperium in imperio* would have been: a colony of *litterati* governed by distinct laws, speaking nothing but Latin, and including in happy harmony Christians, Jews, Turks, infidels, and anything-arians, provided they would only “se conduire en homme de bien, en citoyen honnête, en sincère partisan de la tolérance!” The course of political events fortunately put an end to all those fanciful devices; and if the electorate of Prussia was doomed to exist without its learned city, it received as a substitute an academy established on a humbler footing, but whose services to the cause of literature cannot be too highly appreciated.

The plan of the new society was drawn up, as we have already said, by Leibnitz himself; it was characterized, in the first place, by its essentially practical features. The great philosopher did not wish that the attention of the academicians should be exclusively or even chiefly confined to abstract studies or metaphysical speculations: quite the reverse. What he aimed at creating was a learned corporation whose office would be to spread abroad and disseminate amongst the people at large the useful appliances of science and industry; to examine the merit of new discoveries and of curious inventions—to vulgarize them;

in short, as M. Bartholmèss says, "so to act that the public would more and more respect learned men, whilst learned men devoted themselves more and more for the benefit of the public." (Vol. I., p. 23.) But if Leibnitz wished to make the *Académie de Prusse* a really useful institution, he was no less anxious to stamp it with the mark of true patriotism. "Let the Academy," exclaimed he, "be penetrated with German sentiments; let it be zealous for the glory of Germany."* In order to feel the weight of this expression, we must remember that it had become the fashion on the other side of the Rhine to imitate French manners, French institutions, and French literature; French was spoken at all the German courts; it was, in fact, a positive Gallo-mania. The importation of the doctrines of the *Encyclopédie*, under the reign of Frederick the Great, gave a new evidence that the advice of Leibnitz was not a superfluous one; and we are inclined to add, with M. Bartholmèss, that the measure he recommended had a political, quite as much as a literary importance:—

"Leibnitz must have felt how useful would be the influence of an academy, constituting itself the guardian of the German language and the interpreter of its history; the works of lexicology and of erudition undertaken by the members would help on the political and religious views of Prussia; and this species of literary centralization would accustom the Germans to keep their eyes fixed rather on Berlin than on Vienna."—Vol. I., pp. 24, 25.

The religious character of the statutes drawn up by Leibnitz for the new institute, is a third peculiarity which we cannot omit noticing. In the decree issued at the time of the formation, we find the following remarkable words:—

"Experience proves that the true faith of the Gospel and Christian virtues are especially fostered, both in Christendom and amongst nations still unconverted, by persons who, under the Divine blessing, combine with a blameless life an experienced judgment and sound learning. That is why we feel anxious that our *Société des Sciences* should be foremost in diffusing, under our protection, the true faith and the true virtues to which we are exhorted in the Gospel. Nevertheless the society remains at liberty to employ and associate to its labours persons of other religions as well as other nations."

This is the point which has called forth the sarcastic remarks of those self-styled philosophers, for whom transcendentalism is the *ne plus ultra* of common sense and of sound belief. "Why," they say, "why change the academy into a missionary institute? Why bring together a board of theologians instead of a scien-

* Eine deutschgesinnte Societat.—Eine deutsch-liebende gesellschaft.

tific society?" For our own part, we confess that we do not feel quite disposed to class the work of evangelization on the list of the subjects which should *directly* and *immediately* engage the attention of a learned body; but at the same time we need not repeat the hackneyed remark, that "real science and pure religion always walk hand-in-hand." A glance at the quotation we have given above will show, besides, what most of our readers already know, that on all subjects connected with theology, Leibnitz would never have acted except in accordance with principles of the most comprehensive toleration. The man who, though a Protestant, corresponded with Bossuet, and who numbered some of his dearest friends in the ranks of Roman Catholicism, was the last to sanction the smallest step towards uncharitableness or party spirit.

After all that the illustrious author of the "Théodicée" did for the Academy of Berlin, we regret to have to record in his case another example of that ingratitude which is too frequently the only result obtained by those who have spent their life in the service of the public. His superiority in every way was so evident, that he could not fail to have a great many enemies. Gradually deprived of all his power by the intrigues of a few ambitious place-hunters, who did not scruple to calumniate a man with whom they could find no real fault, he withdrew from Prussia altogether, and died almost suddenly at Hanover, the 14th of November, 1716.

The reign of Frederick William I. had a disastrous effect on the works of the Academy. What protection, what support could *literati* expect from a king whose only ambition was to be a good drill-serjeant, and who governed Prussia as he did a regiment of grenadiers? The relations between the monarch and the *savants* were almost null, and were confined to a few incidents so burlesque in their character, that some of them seemed devoid of all authenticity. M. Bartholmèss quotes the following:—

"A transitory curiosity for the phenomena and properties of nature manifested itself in the king at a dinner offered to him by General Grumbkow, one of the two ministers who had obtained an absolute sway over his eccentric and abrupt temper. Champagne had been served round—a wine which Frederick-William drank freely of, especially when sitting at the table of his favourites. 'Why,' exclaimed he, 'does this wine effervesce?' 'Your majesty,' answered Grumbkow, 'has an academy which could no doubt solve the problem.' 'To be sure, you remind me of it,' said the king; 'it is the least that those fellows can do to be of some use to me.' A letter is immediately dispatched to the learned society; the members assemble, and send an answer to the minister stating, that, in order to comply conscientiously with his majesty's wishes, a long series of experiments

is necessary. To perform these experiments, they require a hamper of sixty bottles, and as soon as *that* is forwarded they will set to work. 'Let them go hang,' exclaimed the king, when he heard the answer; 'I can drink my wine without their help, and it does not matter to me whether I know why it effervesces or not.'"—Vol. I., pp. 84, 85.

This little anecdote, which has at least the merit of being unquestionably authentic, will serve to put in its true light the connexion between the king and the institute. It is almost a matter of surprise that after such an exchange of smart messages, the monarch did not order at once the dissolution of the whole concern. Fortunately, some friend of the Academicians convinced his majesty that the education of the medical staff of the Prussian army might be improved by the discoveries made in the society; and on this consideration it was allowed to subsist.

The reign of Frederick-William I., which, in a political point of view, was fraught with the greatest results for the future destinies of Prussia, is so completely a blank in the history of literature, that we shall say nothing further respecting it, and proceed at once to notice the different influence exercised by Frederick the Great as a *littérateur* himself, and as a patron of literature. He was no sooner on the throne, than by a multitude of seasonable appointments he proved his firm intention of securing for his reign the glory which arises from intellectual, as well as from military pre-eminence.

"In the very first days of June [1740]," says M. Bartholmès, "Frederick II. recalled to Berlin, Du Han, who had shared his exile, and who had become a strict Calvinist: he rewarded him with a seat in the Academy, and a situation in the Foreign Office. Baron von Keyserlingk, equally in disgrace under Frederick-William I., was presented with a colonel's brevet and other distinctions. Two learned officers, the Normand Chazot and the pious Stille, were likewise provided with employment suitable to their tastes. . . . The person by whom all these measures received their accomplishment, Jordan, was named a privy-councillor. Trusted, as early as the 1st of June, with the mission of recognizing the Royal Scientific Society, Jordan communicated to a great number of illustrious personages the wishes of the king, and, thanks to his active politeness, these wishes were so quickly and so favourably responded to, that before the end of the month, Frederick could write to Voltaire: 'I have laid the foundation of our new Academy; I have secured Wolf, Maupertuis, and Algarotti; I am expecting answers from Vaucanson, S'Gravesande, and Euler; my new college for commerce and manufactures is established; I am making bargains with printers and sculptors.'"—Vol. I. pp. 142, 143.

The two most useful innovations with which the name of

Frederick the Great is connected in his capacity as patron of the Prussian Academy, are the creation of a section of metaphysics, and the substitution of the French to the Latin in the discussions, the speeches, and the publications of the members. The *Académie de Prusse* had scarcely been remodelled, with privileges, immunities, revenues, and grants of every description, which were to make it the most influential of all the *corps savants* in Europe, than the disastrous Seven Years' War came to turn the king's attention from the arts of peace to strategical problems and all the circumstance of martial enterprise. During this trying period, the part played by the Academy was most honourable: it made itself the organ of public opinion in cautioning on several occasions the king against ambition; and it is a fact worthy of remark, that whilst Frederick would not allow, even in the bosom of his own family, any reflections on his system of government, the Academicians were always, on the contrary, encouraged to express their opinions freely, and they seldom failed to do so with a firmness which precluded neither loyalty nor affection.

"On this subject," we quote M. Bartholmèss, "no historian has done complete justice to the Academy. Lessing, who was then settled at Berlin, has been praised for devoting the earliest efforts of his pen to a narrative of the first events of the war—a narrative which was published as a political gazette; but we should not forget that it was the Academy which rewarded Lessing by bestowing upon him, as early as 1760, the title of honorary member. A just tribute of admiration has been paid to those warlike lyrics with which the same war inspired another inhabitant of Berlin—to that disciple of Anacreon and Horace, who, without being a soldier himself, took the name of the *Prussian Grenadier*; Gleim piously considered the conqueror of proud Vienna, the liberator of Germany, as a wonderful instrument in the hands of God—an instrument working miracles, whilst denying that miracles could be worked;* but we should not forget that Gleim received the surname of the Prussian Tyrtæus from the Academy of Berlin. In a hundred different ways writers have praised the happy influence of that *polar star*, as Goethe calls Frederick, and celebrated the glorious impulse which the energetic behaviour of the king, of his army, and of his people, gave to literature and to public spirit in Germany, supplying the one with a fruitful principle of enthusiasm and of reflections, whilst it gave to the other the idea of national independence and of patriotic energy.

* Friedrich, oder Gott durch ihn
 Das grosse Werk vollbracht,
 Gebändigt hat das stolze Wien
 Und Teutschland frey gemacht.
 Friedrich täglich Wunder that,
 Und keine Wunder glaubt.

But we should not forget that it was the Academy which first spoke of Frederick as the champion of the smaller states of Germany against the great European powers—as the dreaded defender of the common fatherland on the banks of the Rhine, as well as on those of the Vistula and the Danube.”—Vol. I., pp. 102—104.

How different Frederick the Great's behaviour was towards the Academy from that of another monarch with whom he has often been compared—Napoleon I., who seemed to consider the Institute of France as a *coterie* of thinkers whose only business was to teach science and literature the art of flattery!

But the hero of the Seven Years' War did not long remain satisfied with the part he had assumed, viz., that of patron and protector of the Prussian institute. As soon as peace was restored, he resolved upon identifying himself more and more with the society he had revived, and become its administrator, its curator, its *factotum*. This new step was rather a dangerous one for the Academicians, as it placed them exclusively under the control of the king, and, therefore, imposed some restraints on their discussions; yet, on the whole, the change proved most beneficial, and Frederick had the good sense not to abuse the privilege which he had thus appropriated to himself. He improved considerably the financial affairs of his *savants*; endowed very liberally their library, their collections, their museums; and never departed in the appointments he was called upon to make, from the path of justice and of moderation. Above all, he uniformly allowed the greatest freedom of opinion; and, as M. Bartholmèss very well remarks, the only rule he gave to his Academicians was that they should prevent abuses from going too far.

“He did not command them to follow his example, nor to mount his colours; he only required that they should love work, and tolerate his incredulity. At the death of La Mettrie he did not direct them to compose the panegyric of the Breton materialist, nor to approve the *éloge* which he himself honoured La Mettrie with: on many points he knew full well the Academy's opinion was quite at variance with his own, and he respected that proof of independence. Then he praised Prémontval for declaiming against tyrants, ‘against those men deprived of knowledge, of reason, and of understanding, whose want of power is the cause of their despotism.’* He praised Rædern for setting before the king the example of the elector, and for directing the attention of Prussia to Holland, ‘where the late elector had been brought up amongst free men, far from the flattery of courts, and learnt that glory only resides in the practice of wisdom which employs power and strength to secure the happiness

* 1755, 1757, 1761, *passim*.

of man.* He allowed Formey to repeat, with impunity,† that the only true philosophers are those who are religious, that is to say, who submit to the decrees of Providence. . . . Frederick supported the attacks directed against his metaphysical theories with the greatest good-humour; it was his style of writing alone which he could not bear to see criticized. During the carnival season, which he generally spent at Berlin,‡ whenever he conversed with any of the Academicians on various topics which at all interested him, because he understood them all, he showed himself not only witty and animated, but full of kindness and consideration towards his adversaries. Whether we consider him in the familiarity of social intercourse, or on official occasions, we still find him the same, always knowing how to respect freedom and sincere convictions."—Vol. I., pp. 233, 234.

With such a prince for its chairman, we do not wonder that the reign of Frederick the Great should have proved the golden age of the Prussian institute.

The organization of that society, its rise, its progress, its external history in short, forms the first part of the work we are now reviewing; the second division, by far the most interesting, is a brilliant gallery of portraits, in which we find sketched by a masterly hand the various notabilities admitted into fellowship with it. Amongst the metaphysicians, Béguelin, Mérian, Maupertuis, and Formey were the most conspicuous; Euler and Bernouilli stand prominent on the list of mathematicians; Sulzer was more of a *littérateur*, whilst D'Argens is the ablest representative of the infidel doctrines to which Voltaire and La Mettrie had unfortunately succeeded in converting the king. The various chapters allotted to these writers are full of carefully collected particulars on the history of literature during the eighteenth century; the critical appreciations they contain, though necessarily short, are complete, and illustrated by a variety of quotations which add much to their value. The following view of Frederick the Great himself as a philosopher, deserves quoting:—

"The king formed, with Voltaire and D'Alembert, a kind of triumvirate, but a triumvirate in which equality did not prevail. The two French writers are the masters and the patterns of the Prussian; he follows and imitates them, whilst they praise him and encourage him; happy, because they have for their admirer the hero of the age, and proud at seeing him always, according to their own expressions, 'desperately in love with their genius.' An inquisitive and penetrating mind, restless and fickle as Voltaire, whilst, like

* 1759, *passim*.

† For instance, on January 27, 1780.

‡ Cf. two remarkable letters from Frederick to D'Alembert, January, 1780, and January, 1782.

D'Alembert, he is fond of order, logic, clearness, and sober-mindedness, Frederick shares in the faults of both, and commits the blunders they committed, without having all the qualities which they possessed. He is neither a more profound nor a better metaphysician; he does not attack so skilfully as they did despotism and hypocrisy; when he stands forward to defend the natural rights of man and of society, he is by far inferior to his models. Their favourite weapon, raillery, becomes too often in his hands a mockery full of bitterness, contempt, or even cynicism. His fun is sad, and disposes us to melancholy rather than gaiety. Voltaire and D'Alembert had a serious aim; the reign of justice and of common right was the object they aspired after: with the King of Prussia this disposition does not assume the form of a sympathy both constant and affectionately respectful for the dignity of men, for moral equality between man and man; it too often degenerates into a pseudo-philanthropy either utopian or sarcastic. Frederick, like his teachers, was not an architect, but a soldier, a pioneer; we should distinguish between the good which he did, perhaps unconsciously, and the evil which he committed, often against his own will.

"Frederick, nevertheless, together with Voltaire and D'Alembert, stands in the foremost rank of those who fought for reason and civilization, and who conquered for ever liberty of conscience and of speech. He may accordingly be considered as the apostle of toleration, the adversary of fanaticism, as a thinker and as a sage. If he deserves our esteem by his enthusiasm for equity and humanity, we cannot, on the other hand, help saying that his philosophical opinions were deficient, both in soundness and in originality. But it was, perhaps, difficult for any man to combine in himself two characters so opposite; a spirited pamphleteer, a vehement tribune, can hardly be at the same time a calm observer or an impartial judge. Frederick's system of metaphysics could not but be the reflection of his theory of politics; it could not but be sharp and licentious, rather negative and destructive than fit to form and to preserve; it was more calculated to unsettle the opinions of courts and *salons* whilst amusing them, than to enlighten academies and schools, and through them generations to come."—Vol. I., pp. 301—303.

Such, we believe, is an impartial view of the man whose extraordinary career is one of the most interesting features in the history of the last century.

We wish time would allow us to multiply our extracts from this valuable work. On Euler's philosophical inconsistencies, M. Bartholmèss thus expresses himself:—

"Modern science has shown how the pious Euler was at the same time a materialist (*mécaniste*) in natural philosophy, and a spiritualist in metaphysics, defining bodies by impenetrability and inertia, and the soul by activity and liberty; arguing against the dynamism of Leibnitz, according to which the essence of matter as well as of mind, consists in force—in a vital, substantial, imperceptible unity;

thus opposing to *pre-established harmony*, the old doctrine of *physical influence*, without endeavouring to explain how the soul effectually brings about the motion of the body, and how our organs really affect that portion of ourselves which is not physical—our soul; knowingly mistaking the sense of the word *monad*; understanding it, not as a principle absolutely simple, endowed with life, with perception, with intelligence; but sometimes as a material atom, sometimes as a geometrical point, or a mathematical abstraction. We admire Euler when, collecting together the results of his reflections on the faculty of reasoning, he exhausts with vigorous clearness, and as a true mathematician, the forms which can be assumed by the four figures of the syllogism . . . but we feel painfully affected when we see him mixing so strong objections against idealism, so many sarcasms either bitter or futile, so many accusations as prejudiced as they are common-place.”—Vol. II., p. 167, 168.

From the title of the book, the reader will discover that the greatest part of the *savants* whose labours are noticed by M. Bartholmèss belong to the reign of Frederick the Great. That was really the time when the Prussian Academy assumed its most important position amidst associations of that class; and yet, in glancing at the index of proper names annexed to the volumes before us, we are struck by the fact that most of the industrious writers who were considered less than two hundred years ago as the leading intellectual authorities in Berlin, are now almost forgotten. Which of our friends, we should like to know, has ever heard of Formey? Formey, to whom no less a man than Montesquieu said in a letter: “*Les grands hommes comme vous sont recherchés, on se jette à leur tête!*” And this is only one instance out of many others. Oh! the vanity of human glory!

A propos of the corresponding members, our author supplies in his second volume, on Kant and Kantianism, a masterly *résumé*, which is one of the clearest and most accurate pieces of criticism we have seen of that system. The “*Critique of Pure Reason*,” and the violent discussions it gave rise to—discussions in which Louis Ancillon, at Berlin, took the chief part—are the only facts of importance recorded during the short reign of Frederick-William II.

Under that prince the Academy seems to have lost much of its power; for he was not only jealous of his authority, but also too liable to be misled by intrigues and favouritism. A weak-minded sensualist, he allowed unprincipled women to rule in his name: the notorious Countess Lichtenau and the no less notorious Wöllner were the real sovereigns of Prussia. This state of things, however, did not last. With Frederick-William III., a fresh career of progress and of efficiency opened

for the Academy—a career in which it is now steadily advancing. Memorable as were the days when that learned society numbered amongst its fellows a Mérian, a Euler, a Leibnitz, the lustre conferred on it by such men as Savigny, Niebuhr, and the Humboldts, has rendered its history, during our own times, perhaps still more noteworthy.

In conclusion, we would say that the “*Histoire Philosophique de l'Académie de Prusse*,” is a work which, by itself, would have sufficed to establish the reputation of M. Bartholmèss as a critic and a philosopher. Not only are we indebted to it for much valuable information concerning a society whose annals had never before found a chronicler, but it also contains on the history of literature in general, a mass of details which will render it interesting even to persons the least anxious to read anything on Prussia.

ART. III.—CRITICAL STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. By the Rev. T. H. Horne, B.D., of St. John's College, Cambridge; D.D. of the University of Pennsylvania; Prebendary of St. Paul's. 10th Edition, revised, corrected, and brought down to the present time. Edited by Rev. T. H. Horne, B.D., Rev. Samuel Davidson, D.D., LL.D., and Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, LL.D. 4 vols. 8vo., pp. 624, 1100, 746, 768. Longmans: 1856.

It is a frequent remark of German scholars that English theologians having once published their opinions, seldom change them. Such a history as Hengstenberg's, whose first Commentary on the Psalms is so different in sentiment from the second that they might be the productions of different men, is without a parallel, it is said, in this country. In Germany, similar changes are common enough; in England, they would create uneasiness and surprise. It may be that our English character is in such matters too persistent. Systems and opinions that are immutable are fit only, it may be said, for a perfect state. As things are, immutability is a synonyme for imperfection; mutability, for progress. We do not mean, however, to discuss this question. We introduce it only for the purpose of marking one striking difference between the English and the German mind.

Of late years, the disadvantages connected with this peculiarity of Englishmen have been met in book-making by combination, or by editorships. If the same man is not to express

different views in the same book, or in successive editions of the same book, different men may. The many-sidedness of the German mind may be gained, it seems, by the employment of many English minds. The development and growing maturity of sentiment which our English notions forbid to any one writer can be secured for his work, at least, by notes and additions; till at length we get a "Horne's Introduction," (say) as much in advance of the original Horne, as it might have been, if the venerable prebendary of St. Paul's had studied all his life at Heidelberg, and the *last* edition of his *magnum opus* had been printed, in German fashion, to show how completely he had missed the truth in the *first*. At all events we have here a book containing many opinions very different from those given in the earlier editions;—and these avowedly the *latest* opinions of the writer, but likely enough, as we believe, to undergo still further change.

We cannot say that the principle on which this edition is got up pleases us. Joint authorship has its advantages. It admits of progress and variety. In dictionaries, cyclopædias, and similar works, it is appropriate: and the inconveniences connected with it are small compared with the fulness and accuracy which division of labour secures. But in systematic treatises it is seldom desirable. Unity and harmony are, in such cases, of first importance; and for these there needs to be *one* mind. Beaumont and Fletcher, indeed, are said to have written better dramas than either could have written apart. The insect world, too, is large enough to require both Kirby and Spence to marshal its entomological hosts and to describe them. And now and then a Conybeare and a Howson throw light on the studies of each other and on some one grand theme. But in all such cases it will be found that the joint authors are men of congenial habits, that they have studied together, and have thoroughly harmonized their thoughts and modes of utterance. Then, the reader gets harmony and variety, the consistent unity of one mind, with the richness of many. It is a sad illustration of the soundness of these views, that already the literary and religious worlds have been annoyed by the scandal of one author of these volumes, protesting against the statements of another; while the hope of unity which the title page excites is nipped in the bud by the various prefaces. Who is to blame for these scandals, it is not necessary now to inquire; we are thankful to be able to ascribe no small part of the blame to the principle on which the book is composed. If we were asked to give a *recipe* for creating quarrels among authors, it would be—"Take three or more men, let them write four thick volumes, on topics of the utmost difficulty, variety, and importance, including

questions of criticism, antiquity, chronology, history, the origin and peculiarities of the oldest books in the world; add the theological element, and let these topics refer to inspiration, the extent of depravity, the plan of salvation, the everlasting destinies of men; let these three or more men be trained in different schools, have all the force of thought (not to say pertinaciousness) which mature age or independent investigation brings, give them few opportunities of conference, publish their work under their joint names, and the result is likely to be tenfold worse than anything we have yet witnessed." It is not the *one* protest that surprises us; it is that there has been *only one*. If we have not several, it will be owing either to the forbearance of the editors, or to the fact that the book is *known* not to aim at the consistent unity which is so desirable in such a treatise.

But to come to the volumes themselves. The first and third are entirely by Mr. Horne, and are substantially as they were published in the ninth edition: the *first* on the Genuineness, Authenticity, Uncorrupted Preservation, and Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; the *third* on Biblical Geography and Antiquities. The character of these volumes is but little altered. There is the same fulness of extract, the same catholicity of reference and quotation, the same devout practical tone, and, it may be added, the same want of thorough assimilation. The reader feels instinctively that his teacher is a compiler rather than an originator; nor is he convinced that the compiler has complete mastery of his theme. Additions have been made from Layard and other writers, though these are too obviously accretions; between which and parts of the text even there is occasional discrepancy. Books are described as the most "recent," though that epithet has long ceased to be appropriate; while in other instances statements are retained, which books published since these statements were made ought to have been employed to modify or correct.* No competent man would now write just such volumes on Scripture evidences or antiquities; but we give the volumes, notwithstanding, a cordial welcome. They contain judicious and useful compends of books and facts not accessible to most readers, and form a monument of the diligence, the conscientiousness, and the catholic spirit of their author. It is but just to add, too, that there are dissertations on the Apocrypha, on the Symbolical Language of Scripture, and

* For example, Hume's objection to the Pentateuch, that it is unsupported by contemporaneous history, is met by the assertion that there is no history that is contemporaneous; while Hengstenberg's method of reply, by appealing to the monuments of Egypt, is overlooked. In the same way, the discussion on the necessity of Revelation makes no mention of the Essays of Tholuck or of Whately, certainly among the ablest books on that subject.

on kindred topics much more full than are to be found in the earlier editions of the book. On the other hand we miss from the second volume the Bibliographical Appendix to which most book-buying readers were in the habit of referring. We have, indeed (in the 4th vol.), a list of the editions of *the Holy Scriptures*, in the original languages and in the *ancient* versions; but all else has been struck out. We have no hesitation in saying that such an appendix, embracing the whole department of biblical literature, and complete to our own day, with brief, characteristic comments on the books named, would have been as welcome to biblical students as any part of these volumes. This omission is a mistake.

The novelties of the work are in the second and fourth volumes. The latter is written in part by Dr. Tregelles, who has rewritten the chapters on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, and revised the introductions to the several books. With respect to this second portion of his labours, he says:—

“Here I am, not author, but simply editor. I felt that I stood on very different ground from that which I had occupied with regard to the textual portion of the volume. I had not so much to consider how I should have treated the subjects, as what additions may be needful, in consequence of modern research, to what the Rev. T. H. Horne had himself stated. It was not for me to pull down one edifice in order to erect another in its stead; to do this for the mere sake of change, would be like removing an old manor house to make room for a trim Italian villa. Some would have wished that the quotations of earlier writers given by Mr. Horne should be omitted: to do this in general was, however, equally opposed to my *judgment* and *inclination*: for there are few things to which it is now more needful to direct the attention of biblical students than that there were biblical scholars before those who have lived and written during the last thirty years. To many now the investigations of such foreigners as Eichhorn and Michaelis seem things almost unknown; and such seem unconscious that we ever had biblical scholars in our own country. To such the names of Lardner and others are unfamiliar, and their works are almost or quite unknown. I am, therefore, glad that such citations remain as given by Mr. Horne, and I hope that they may be the means of directing some students to the works of those who lived before the present generation. Had there not been such an ignoring of what others have done long ago, and such obliviousness as to their works, we should not find so many new *discoveries* made as to points long ago investigated and known. It is the part of wisdom for scholars now to combine all that is *true* in recent research with the *ascertained facts* of earlier inquiry.”

Just thus ought a book like Horne's Introduction to be edited; and if the whole had been executed in this spirit and on these principles, our notice would have been more brief and pleasant.

But we must not anticipate. It is enough to call the reader's special attention to the extract.

The *first* portion of Dr. Tregelles's labours is all that can be wished. Full, clear, scholarly, and devout, it deserves to become the text-book of New Testament criticism. In his favourite theory, indeed,—that the text of Scripture is to be taken from the *earliest* authorities—we are not prepared unreservedly to acquiesce. It is only a theory, not self-evident, nor is it as yet supported by facts sufficiently general and decisive to justify strong assertions in relation to it. But this theory is maintained with such fairness, and is itself so far true, that we have no objection to urge against the volume on that ground. There is, moreover, throughout so much justice done to other theories, and so much valuable information given on MSS. and versions generally, that even if the authority of the most ancient documents had been asserted with greater exclusiveness, we should still have deemed the volume to be well worthy of careful study. The time the author has himself devoted to these inquiries, and the great enthusiasm which his book displays, give to his discussions the interest and the accuracy of a personal narrative, and assure the student that he is travelling with one who knows every turn of the road, and who is at once a competent and a willing guide. This part of the volume is an original treatise—not a compilation—and though original, yet complete.

The *second* volume is from the pen of Dr. Davidson, Professor of Exegesis in the Lancashire College. It is devoted to the criticism of the Old Testament, and to interpretations generally; and contains somewhat copious introductions to the several books of the Old Testament and of the Apocrypha. The first portion on Biblical Criticism is brief, because the author has written at length upon the subject in his treatise on Biblical Criticism. The portion on Interpretation is also brief, for a similar reason; and the purpose of the writer is that both sets of books should be connected, and that the reader should follow the last in preference to the first, "except where the older occupies independent ground of its own" (Pref. iv.) "The writer alone," he adds, "is responsible for all to which his name is prefixed. None of his fellow-labourers is accountable for anything in his portion." (Pref. vii.)

Before proceeding to notice this volume, a preliminary remark or two may be offered on what may fairly be expected in such an Introduction as the one now under review. It is necessary to define our *measure*, before affirming how far any work has departed from it. Nor do we anticipate any grave objections to our views of this part of the case. *First* of all, it will be allowed that a book of this sort ought to be homogeneous.

There should be general harmony of style and thought in the different portions of it. No one would prefer a treatise of Cudworth's on the Eternal Obligations of Virtue, with notes and additions by William Paley or Jeremy Bentham; or a tractate of Jones Loyd's on the Currency, edited by Mr. Muntz; or the Political Economy of Adam Smith, supplemented by Sir E. Lytton Bulwer. Such unions have only one defence, the defence of which old Fuller was so fond—"no objection can lie against the match, for the parties are *nothing akin*." In all other respects they are unsuitable. By themselves, each member of the union may be well enough: bring them together, and they become intolerable. Some such feeling has passed through our mind repeatedly in examining Dr. Davidson's volume. His style, and tendencies, and conclusions, all differ from those of his author; and though he warns you that he only is responsible for what he has written, the reader's sense of propriety is shocked, and he feels fretted and chagrined. Dr. Davidson denies that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, though willing to allow that we owe the germ of it to him; Solomon had nothing to do with Ecclesiastes; the book of Job was not written till after the Assyrian captivity,* and the believers of that day had only a "faint foreboding"—a glimmering hope—of a future state. The beautiful confession in that book, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," refers chiefly to deliverance from temporal distress, and contains no allusion to the Messiah. Such are some of his conclusions. Mr. Horne would certainly oppose them all; and Dr. Tregelles probably would oppose most. Mr. Horne's introduction is emphatically an Englishman's book; Dr. Davidson's is essentially German. The one quotes largely from English authorities, and is adapted to the reading of English divines: the quotations of the other are nine-tenths of them from books of which many well-educated clergymen have never heard. Mr. Horne's style is cautious, respectful, and conciliatory; Dr. Davidson's is loose, somewhat flippant and irritating. The merits of the two writers we are not now discussing; but it is certainly unfortunate that their books are not published *apart*. The only excuse for the union is as before—"that they are *nothing akin*."

A second requisite in a book of this order, is that it should make the reader fairly familiar with the standard *English* literature of the subjects it discusses; and that its statements

* We notice that Sir Henry Rawlinson assigns a similar date to this book. His reasons are, that Bildad is a Persian name, and that the tribes to which Job's friends belonged are not found in the neighbourhood of Uz till towards the captivity.

should be in forms which the mere English student can appreciate. We do not under-value German scholarship; we should hail a volume that thoroughly investigated the views of German authors. We have given all the heartier welcome to Dr. Davidson's previous works, because they generally discuss Continental authorities. Even in such an Introduction as Horne's, moreover, we expect the results of *all* modern inquiry, German inquiry not excepted. But to make the staple of the volume German theories, and practically ignore most of our own English literature, is a mistake. It was one of the excellencies of the earlier editions of Mr. Horne, that he sought to guide the student to other works, at once enabling him to satisfy his judgment and extend his knowledge of English theology. In this volume, the references are nearly all to foreign authors. For every Englishman quoted, we are introduced to the names of, at least, six Germans, and an ill-natured critic might add, in the earlier part the Englishman is Dr. Davidson himself as often as not; nor are these references always, or even generally, made so as to be available for the common reader. It is said, for example, that such a hypothesis is maintained by Schuhlmann, Von Cölln, Vatke, and Stickel, but the reasons they allege are untenable. For various solutions of stated difficulties, or answers to objections, the student is referred to Keil and Wette, and to the former, not because his book is the *best*, but because it is the *latest*. Our readers will not misunderstand these remarks. For such discussions we should be among the first to thank Dr. Davidson. We gladly avail ourselves of his labours. But *here* they are out of place. "The piece put in from the new agreeth not with the old," and the rent is made worse.

A *third* quality essential to an acceptable introduction, is a calm, judicial tone—a style of utterance, of illustration, and of thought, that shall win the confidence of its readers. The smartness that may be becoming enough in an advocate, is inappropriate in a judge. Repetitions, platitudes of expression, Ishmaelitish attacks on books and men, are peculiarly unwelcome. And we must confess to having noticed more of these than we could have wished.

Take the following—its *forms of utterance*. Amidst a somewhat touching allusion to his labours, he expresses the hope that, "if he has cut away some of the traditional fat of hereditary sentiment, the diseased alone has been removed;" yet he "can hardly expect to escape censure from parties wedded to antiquated notions." What "traditional fat" is we hardly know, and fear it is not worth knowing; nor, with much to try the patience of some readers, is it wise to stigmatize them by such descriptions. Again:—

"The authority which should rightfully be attached to the works of the Fathers of the Christian church, has been very variously estimated. While they need not be depreciated unduly, neither need they be excessively extolled. A just medium should be observed. Taking them as a body of interpreters, we cannot place them in a high rank. They had learning, piety, and zeal. They did much to recommend the truth to the acceptance of others. But their learning was by no means extensive, accurate, or profound. It was superficial and shallow. They did not understand the Scriptures in their original languages."

And so on, through two long paragraphs, in which we are told that the Greek Fathers are well worth studying, because of their familiarity with the *Greek* tongue, the original language, we had always thought, of the New Testament—a portion, at least, of the Scriptures.

As an example of a *judicial tone* :—

"Good commentaries are rare; indifferent ones are plentiful. D'Oyley and Mant's is a compilation; and a very meagre and insufficient one. A. Clarke's is little better than a compilation gathered out of many heterogeneous sources. Dodd's is still more so, and inferior. There is also a commentary from Henry and Scott, *manufactured by George Stokes*, and published by the Religious Tract Society. . . . We recommend the student carefully to eschew all such."—Vol. II., p. 383.

Again :—

"Those who read the Bible mainly for edification will refrain from critical and philological expositions. They will take up with Matthew Henry, the greater part of whose remarks are mere preaching, not proper interpretation; or, perhaps, with Scott, who preaches less, though he paraphrases too much, and really expounds but little. But ministers of the gospel will go to Hammond, Whitby, Mac-knight, Campbell, Elsley, and Slade," &c.—Vol. II., p. 381.

As a specimen of an *Ishmaelitish spirit*—the rule which teaches that no doctrine can be proved from Scripture that is contrary to reason or the analogy of faith, is commended by an attack on the doctrine of Original Sin *as taught* by Calvin and Edwards, and, we may add, by Richard Watson and the Wesleyans. Another rule is illustrated by a criticism on the Westminster Divines. (Vol. II., p. 480.) In all these cases Dr. Davidson may be right; but we deem it very unfortunate that his examples are such as will tempt half his readers to question the rules they are meant to illustrate.

To the class of *infelicitous utterances* we are disposed to assign a passage (p. 368), which has excited in us some surprise :—

"The importance of studying the Fathers," says Dr. Davidson, "is

enhanced in our view by the fact that *the germ alone* of certain primary truths is contained in the Bible, to be developed thereafter by the spiritual intelligence and consciousness of the true church. The New Testament contains Christian doctrine and duty *in essence*, but they are not fully developed there. Believers, penetrated by the spirit of Christ, were to unfold them by degrees, in proportion to their attainments in the divine life and knowledge."

What this may be made to mean, we cannot tell. There are, no doubt, passages in Scripture whose full meaning is not yet discovered, and which are perhaps reserved, as Boyle expressed it, "to quell some future heresy, or resolve some yet unformed doubt, or confound some error that hath not a name," or, we may add, prove by fresh prophetic evidence that the Bible came from God. Scripture is, in a word, like "the deep sea, beautifully clear," and yet "immeasurably profound;" so that there is no definable limit to our insight into its meaning. But to speak of primary truths as taught only in germ, and to be developed by the spiritual consciousness of men, or of bodies of men, is either to speak very loosely, or it is to deny the completeness of Scripture revelation, on primary truths too, and to hold the inspiration of the Christian church. Probably the former alternative is the true solution of the case; but either alternative weakens our reliance on the caution and judgment of our teacher.

Of other essential qualities we note no deficiency. There is competent scholarship, devout feeling, reverence for all that is religious and moral in Scripture, with an obvious conviction of the importance of piety, and of man's need of divine teaching to comprehend its truths. Withal, however, there is, as we have said, too much in the tone we cannot commend.

The fault of the book is the theory of the writer on the subject of inspiration. He maintains that part of the Bible *is* the word of God, and part *not*. When the writers speak of religious and moral truth, they were under a peculiarly divine guidance; when they speak of matters collateral to religion, such as points of history, geography, natural science, &c., they are left much more to themselves. He is disposed to allow no more mistakes in this department *than are proved*; but he expects them, and believes that the writers are neither infallible nor, in fact, always accurate. (Pp. 503, 504.)

The extent to which Dr. Davidson carries this theory it is not easy to define. He quotes with approbation the views of Dr. Pye Smith, as given in the *Congregational Magazine* for 1837, p. 422,* of Dr. Arnold, as appealed to by Mr. Newman

* If we were not anxious to avoid by-questions, we should formally demur to some of these quotations. The venerated name of Pye Smith

("Phases of Faith," pp. 67, 68, 4th ed.), of Baden Powell, and of Tholück; and he says generally that the mission of the writers of Scripture was a religious one:—They "*were religious and moral* teachers, but they were not teachers of geography or history. Their commission did not extend so far" (p. 373).

The following are samples of the application of the theory, and illustrate the extent to which he carries it. In the Old Testament, the inspired compiler often followed different historical *documents*; and as these documents were sometimes discrepant in chronology and history, there are naturally discrepancies in the inspired narrative. Hence the discrepancies in Gen. xxxviii. and 1 Sam. xvi. (pp. 519, 518, 512, 511, 514). In both Testaments, the inspired writers followed in their narratives different *traditions*. These traditions did not agree; neither, of course, do the narratives based upon them. Hence discrepancies in the history of the denial of Peter (p. 540); in the order of the facts of the Resurrection (p. 545); and in Heb. ix. 4, as compared with 1 Kings viii. 9. Sometimes the inspired writer forgets or confounds the facts, as does the author of Chronicles (p. 526); as does Mark, mistaking Abiathar for Ahimelech (p. 551). Even an eye-witness may be *mistaken*; and hence of John's statement—that our Lord was brought forth to the people at the *sixth* hour—it is said: it "cannot be correct. It must either be changed into *third*, or be looked upon as an original mistake, of no consequence in so trivial a matter." We trust that we do Dr. Davidson no wrong in these extracts. His meaning is frequently obscured by repetition. Some allowance too must be made for his tendency to startle and shock his readers; but still it seems clear that he holds that the true solution of many difficulties is—"Here the inspired writers are *mistaken*;" "This is the human in their writings, not the divine;" and further, that in matters of science, chronology, and history, the inspiration of Scripture does not warrant the correctness of its teaching.

Now, in relation to these statements, we may remark, in the first place, that each is simply a hypothesis, and that the whole form, as set forth in the last sentence, a theory; a theory, moreover, neither justified by any defined principle, nor required by the facts. Theories in theology are of course allowable. They are intended to explain Scripture, or to set forth its

ought not to be retained as favouring Dr. Davidson's views. The statements quoted from his papers in the *Congregational Magazine* for 1837, are very materially modified by other statements in the same magazine for 1838, pp. 552—555. This fact ought to have been noted, especially as Dr. Smith maintains that in the narratives of Scripture, inspiration is a "guarantee of their authenticity and truth."

teaching in a brief form, and sometimes to meet objections. They are, however, to be held only as theories. They are things not proved; nor are they in any case the only conceivable solution or summary of the facts. If they are so, they become comprehensive truths, and are as much divine as the statements or facts that prove them. As theories, they are purely *human*, and have no *claim* on our belief. To illustrate our meaning: in Mark xiv. 25, it is said that Jesus was crucified at the *third* hour, i.e. in Jewish reckoning, at nine in the morning. John says that Jesus was led forth to the people just previous to his bearing the cross about the *sixth* hour, i.e. if it be in Jewish reckoning, about noon. Here is a discrepancy; and upon any one of the following suppositions it is explained:—1. Transcribers *may* have written in John *sixth* for *third*, as indeed some MSS. read. 2. About the sixth hour *may* be a general description of what commenced about the third, and was completed by the sixth. 3. John *may* have reckoned, according to a Roman reckoning, from midnight; the more probably, as when he wrote, the Jews were scattered, and the Roman power and tongue had become more widely extended throughout the East; or, 4. It *may* be said John has mistaken the hour, and the matter is too trivial to be made a ground of objection to his narrative. Now, to say nothing of the improbability of a mistake, in a case where if it is allowed it has the effect of shortening *by one half the mortal agony of the cross*; and in a narrative which the writer solemnly affirms to be *true* (xxi. 24); and by a man who remembered the very day and hour when he first visited his Lord (John i. 35—40), it is plain that the supposition of a mistake is as much a supposition as any of the other suggested solutions. It has less evidence in its favour than any, and much less than some; and it is but a supposition after all. We note this fact because it is the fashion of the advocates of this theory and similar theories to decry all explanations but their favourite one as mere hypotheses: an objection that applies at least as strongly to their own.

Turning from single instances to the sweeping theory—that in history, &c., the inspiration of Scripture does not warrant its accuracy—we note again that it is purely a theory. The alleged facts, as Dr. Davidson states them, are, that inspired writers sometimes copy discrepant documents, or follow discrepant traditions, without correcting them; and that in a very few and unimportant and ascertainable instances they make mistakes. Surely the only logical conclusion is (we are not speaking of the *moral* effect of such a state of facts, supposing them to be facts, upon the minds of most men), that *in such cases* there is inaccuracy; but *in all other cases* we have good

reason to trust the writers, whose character and general fidelity are unimpeached. Here again we are not examining the accuracy of the premises. We only affirm that the *general untrustworthiness* of the inspired writers in history is, as a theoretical conclusion based on alleged facts, as scanty and as inconclusive as can well be conceived. So that if it be thought a satisfactory answer to the infidel, who objects to the inaccuracy of *portions* of the sacred narrative, to say that the *whole* is inaccurate, more or less, we must rob the answer of its force by affirming that it is more theoretical and less true than the objection itself. If it were true, nothing would be gained by it. As the case really is, we hold it to be as false as it is futile. Again, let not this reasoning be misapprehended. The popular objection to the universal trustworthiness of the inspired writers is, that it is a *theory* of inspiration. Admit it to be so, it is a theory sustained by ten thousand facts, and involved in the nature of inspiration itself; while the opposite view—that the histories of Scripture are not trustworthy—is also a theory, without more than the scantiest evidence at most on its side.

But perhaps it will be said that the fallibility of the writers of the Bible on matters of history or science follows from the admitted principle of a divine revelation. That revelation is a revelation of religious truth, not of science or of history. To seek the latter, therefore, in the Bible, is to seek the dead among the living, and to mistake the very nature of a divine communication.—This is one form of Dr. Davidson's argument. The inspired writers, says he in substance, were not commissioned to teach either history or science, and, therefore, when they teach either, we are not implicitly to follow them. Now, in this reasoning, as it seems to us, both the premises and the conclusion are wrong. From the reverence of the inspired writers for Scripture; their denunciations against such as speak in God's name when He has not sent them, or add to God's word, we should have supposed the true *conclusion* from such premises to be: "They were not commissioned to teach history, and, therefore, they do *not* teach it." "They were moral and religious teachers only, and they confined themselves to the proper functions of their office." The premises, moreover, are unsound. What the inspired writers were commissioned to teach is to be gathered from what they have taught; and to affirm that history was not included in their commission is to deny one of the most remarkable facts connected with the Christian revelation. It is emphatically truth taught in examples—the facts of creation, providence, and redemption, set forth historically in their connexion with God as Creator, Ruler, and Redeemer. It may be true that to teach history is not a

chief business of the Bible: it may be true also that history is taught only in connexion with the church, or Providence, or human salvation. But this is only saying that the history of the Bible is *moral* and religious; so that if our faith in that history is shaken, we can rely neither on its morality nor on its religion.

The same principle is put by Dr. Davidson in another form. The inspired writers, he says, had clearly not a *full* knowledge of all the facts, some of which they describe; and, therefore, may we not believe that they had *not* an *accurate* knowledge. Luke, for example, records events in an order differing in some cases from the order of Matthew; and if he knew not the time to which each event belongs, may he not have been mistaken in respect to other circumstances? But here again the premise is a mere supposition (though, no doubt, highly probable in some cases), and the conclusion has no connexion with it. Luke *may* have known the time, and have deemed it best to classify his facts on some other principle, as in the case of the temptation in the wilderness, and the death of John the Baptist; and if it be true that he had *not* full knowledge of time or other things, all these other things are unrecorded; and why should we therefore conclude that he had not accurate knowledge of what he *does* record? Admit this reasoning, and all revelation becomes uncertain. The inspired writers had not *full* knowledge of even the moral and religious truths which they taught. One of the most enlightened of them affirms that he knew "in part" and prophesied "in part." Are we, therefore, to reject his teaching?

We gladly avow our conviction that the logical conclusions, which follow from Dr. Davidson's statements, he himself would in a large measure disavow. He maintains strenuously that in matters of morals and religious truth, Scripture is our guide, and our only guide. He is disposed to maintain also, that the errors of the inspired writers in history and science are, in fact, trivial and inimportant. They belong not to the essentials of the faith. But then he has fallen into the snare of many philosophic minds. He has generalized too soon and too largely. He has given utterance to propositions of wide sweep and of very extensive application—propositions which, if true, will not be confined to unimportant matters, nor can be:—not to insist upon the objection, that no two men are likely to agree on what is unimportant in statements which involve religious truth, and the character of inspired men.

We note, secondly, of this theory that it is based upon a distinction unsanctioned by anything in Scripture; and involves, so far as it goes, a practical denial of its claims as an inspired

book. The theory distinguishes, it will be marked, between the religious and the historical—claims divine authority for the first, and denies it to the second. The distinction is of vital importance. If true, it solves all difficulties, though at the expense of a large portion of Scripture. And yet, not one word is said in Scripture of the distinction itself. On the contrary, the historical and the ethical portions of the Old Testament are quoted with equal reverence. The facts named in Hebrews xi. seem as much parts of the word of God as the ethical descriptions of Romans iii. The *history* of Paul's conversion he himself gives as an evidence of his divine authority (Gal. i. 20); and if the evidence itself is not necessarily accurate, what becomes of the conclusion? Above all, how is it that a book which professes to be a succession of revelations from God, reaches us with a large admixture of human additions; and yet without a single intimation what these additions are, or even a hint that such additions have been made?

To the further remark, that this theory is, as far as it goes, a practical denial of the claims of the Bible as an *inspired book*, we anticipate no objection. Whatever be included in inspiration, and whatever notions be entertained on the subject of inspiration, or modes—suggestion, superintendence, illumination, the verbal dictation of certain truths, and what not,—the least that can be claimed for an inspired book is that it be *trustworthy*—that men may believe its teachings and rely upon them. "In the compilation of a narrative," says Dr. Pyc Smith in substance, "the office of inspiration is to guarantee its authenticity and truth." . . . "Veracity and accuracy are all we want."* But these assuredly we *do* want. And these this theory withholds from all in Scripture that is historical, that is, from a large portion of the sacred books. We gladly allow that Dr. Davidson himself maintains the accuracy of the history of Scripture in essential matters; only we must hold that his principle denies its *inspired* accuracy, and tends to destroy all reliance upon it as the word of God.

Having criticized the theory of Dr. Davidson at such length, we feel bound to say a few words on the difficulties which his theory is intended to solve. That there are difficulties, say apparent contradictions, we allow. But let the reader mark—that many of them are *textual*, and are removed by ascertaining the true reading of the contradictory statements. Dr. Davidson has done good service by carefully enumerating many of this class. They are, of course, not mistakes of the *inspired text*, but of the *human copy*. Many again are owing to a misconception

* Congregational Magazine, September, 1838.

of what inspiration means and does. Dr. Davidson, for example, quotes Job xxix. 18, to prove that Job believed in a "phœnix," a fabulous bird, and had, therefore, crude notions of natural history: and Dr. Tregelles answers him by showing that in all probability the original is rightly translated as in our English version, "sand;" and thus Job's character as a natural historian is re-established. But what has the question to do with the inspiration of this book? No one affirms that Job's speeches were *inspired*, that is, that Job teaches in God's name. His follies and mistakes, and the follies and mistakes of a thousand others are recorded; nay, even the follies and mistakes of the inspired writers themselves. And yet, the inspired *accuracy of the record* remains unimpeached. The *only* difficulties with which we are concerned, are difficulties that arise from the apparent discrepant teaching, *as from God*, of inspired men. To these exclusively our inquiries should be confined. Still more of our Scripture difficulties are owing, as we believe, to a vicious system of interpretation. Men confound with Scripture teaching their own inferences, and then they ascribe to that teaching the inaccuracies that originate really with themselves. In other words, what God in Scripture does teach in clear and explicit terms *on history and on science*, we believe; but we must not charge upon Him meanings which a sound exegesis disowns. It must be plain that the alleged doctrine *is* His teaching. For example, some hold, and Dr. Davidson among them, that the Hebrew for the expanse above the earth (Gen. i.) means something firm and solid; so that when it is said that God made the expanse, it is concluded that the Hebrews had most inaccurate notions on astronomy. Now, to say nothing of the questionableness of the etymology (for the root means *to beat out*), who fails to see that the conclusion is altogether irrelevant? We may as well charge Addison with worse than barbaric ignorance, because he speaks of the "firmament," a term which also implies solidity! In a similar spirit it is concluded from Rom. v. that the Bible teaches that the death of *all* animal life is a consequence of sin; and the facts of geology are quoted in proof of the "mistake." But this conclusion is a mere inference, and, apart from geology, an *unlikely* inference. The life of the brute and the life of man are in Genesis carefully distinguished; and the obvious aim of the apostle is to give the history of *our* race, and not of brutes. If, moreover, brutes are included in Romans in the ruin, they are included no less in the restoration by our Lord. Here again the mistake is not in Scripture, but in the human interpretation. The "*pillars of the earth*," the "*setting of the sun*," and many other expressions belong to the same class. Such expressions are not meant to

affirm that the earth has *pillars*, or that the sun *sets*. They are utterances common to all languages, and we may be sure if the Bible meant to teach what some have *inferred* from these terms, its teachings would have been put in a very different form.

These explanations, however, will not exhaust all the difficulties of Scripture. To meet such as remain, we have two other suggestions. First, in nearly all narratives of the same events in common life by different witnesses, discrepancies appear; and though an advocate may try, on this ground, to set aside the authority of the witnesses, the judge will affirm that if the men are otherwise credible, and *on any reasonable supposition* the discrepancies can be harmonized, then these discrepancies rather attest their fidelity than the reverse. If the witness is known to be honest and competent, untruthfulness or ignorance is the least admissible solution of the case. So in Scripture: nearly all the discrepancies vanish, on certain suppositions, any one of which is allowable, and the least likely of which is more probable, under the circumstances, than the supposition of the ignorance or dishonesty of the writers. Luke's genealogy, for example, differs from Matthew's, but if each is taken from acknowledged public records, or if Luke's gives the descent of our Lord through Mary, the discrepancies cease, or cease to be an argument against the legal accuracy of either. Mr. Newman's assertion, that both are gross mistakes, is a third *supposition*, as improbable as it is irreverent. Here we entirely concur with Dr. Tregelles:—

"That nothing is a contradiction in Scripture if a solution can be suggested: it may be that the solution proposed does not happen to be the true one; but still, if any can be stated which would meet the facts of the case, it proves that they *can* be met, and that, therefore, the notion of insurmountability is futile; and then it recoils against the mental perceptions of those who can maintain it."—Horne iv., *Pref.*

If, after all, discrepancies still remain, then our *second* suggestion is, that they are at present insoluble; a case very analogous to many in science and in common life; but so few will they be found to be in Scripture that they will create no anxiety in the mind of the devout and right-hearted student. The man who takes pains enough to *see them*, only needs to take a little more, and he will either *see through them*, or they will cease to disturb his repose.

Perhaps it may be said that all this reasoning is in support of a *foregone* conclusion,—that we begin with holding the truth of the history of the Bible, and then seek out arguments to defend it; and we plead guilty to this charge. We have commenced the study of the Bible by examining, first of all, what it *claims* to be. We have found in the words of our Lord and of Paul the most

decisive assertions of a divine commission; of the guidance of the Holy Spirit in their teaching. We have marked how they claim the same authority for the Old Testament, for nearly each book, and for the collected books. We have been forced to conclude that either we must admit this claim, or deny that the writers were even *good* men. We have examined the *evidence* of their claims, tested their character, listened to the tale of their sufferings, investigated the testimony of their adversaries, marked the ten thousand incidental proofs of truthfulness which their own narratives and all antiquity supply. We have seen, moreover, in the history of the church, how objection after objection has melted away, or furnished fresh evidence of the literal accuracy of their story, till the conclusion has become irresistible, that they are honest, truthful, inspired men. We then turn to the difficulties of the inspired record, which have shrunk within *our* memory from scores to units; and while prepared to admit whatever is *proved*, we confess that to admit, at this stage, either the dishonesty or the ignorance of the writers on topics they profess to teach, seems to us an admission as inconsistent with the common principles of evidence as it is derogatory to the authority of the Scriptures. Anything seems, to us, more likely than that these men penned as true what they did not know, or had no sufficient reason to believe, and then arranged to place their documents in an inspired volume. Let the student begin by treating the word of God as men treat His works. Be sure, first of all, that it *is* His word: then hold fast the principle that what God teaches as true is true; that "*Scriptura Mendax*" is a theory as improbable as the old corresponding theory "*Natura Mendax*;" and we venture to affirm that he will find fewer difficulties in the first than in the second, that the difficulties of both will gradually yield to devouter inquiry and further light, till at last all becomes plain; if not in our day, or on earth, then in the days of our children, or in heaven.

We trust our readers will not suppose from these remarks, that we are unmindful of Dr. Davidson's services to the cause of Biblical Science. There is much in his previous works we value; there is much in this volume deserving of careful study. We are not sure that we have always caught his meaning; and shall rejoice to be told that we have misapprehended it. But on the supposition that he holds the sweeping theory we have attempted to define, we cannot but denounce it. It is ill-timed; it is, in Horne, out of place; and we believe it to be, as a theory, untrue. If this supposition is wrong, we can only apologize for a very natural mistake, and implore our author to write more guardedly. With great satisfaction shall we, in that case, withdraw this censure, though in so doing we condemn ourselves.

ART. IV.—SIR JOHN MALCOLM.

The Life and Correspondence of Sir John Malcolm, G.C.B. From Unpublished Letters and Journals. By John William Kaye. Two Vols. Smith, Elder, & Co.

THE career of Sir John Malcolm was in all respects remarkable. It is distinctly identified with the history of our Indian administration, and of our Persian diplomacy. In Persia, indeed, Malcolm was less unmistakably successful than in India; yet, even there, some positive results, of no inconsiderable importance, ensued from the missions which he conducted with such signal spirit and discretion. In India, however, his memory claims companionship with that of Lord Hastings, one of the best and greatest of those statesmen who built upon the broad foundations laid by Clive. His services in the civil and military departments displayed the resources of a versatile mind in which nothing was superficial. A brave and cautious soldier, a judicious commander, a ready tactician, a diplomatist armed at all points, and an admirable administrator, he chiefly excelled, as Mr. Kaye remarks, in the art of governing men in a rude state of society. Proficient as an historian, highly qualified as a negotiator, equally distinguished in a battle or a tiger-hunt, his influence over the natives of India was absolutely overpowering. When Lord Amherst resigned, there was not a man living who deserved more than Malcolm the appointment of governor-general; of course he did not obtain it. That great lieutenancy is an appanage of the House of Peers; no Malcolm will be promoted to its imperial honours, while there is an earl with an exhausted rent-roll, or a viscount whose necessities are claims upon the public exchequer. The real statesman is the subordinate; the puppet is his superior. The fact, therefore, that Sir John Malcolm could have assumed the government of India at a day's notice, at any time after the settlement of the Central provinces, had no more influence upon the Ministry at home than the application of a half-pay captain for the chief command of the army would have had upon Sir Robert Walpole. Still, he rose to a position of considerable dignity and authority: he was a major-general in the army, the governor of an Indian presidency, twice an envoy at the Court of Persia, and once a member of Parliament. The only discomfiture of his life, it may be said, was in the House of Commons. He was by no means an orator; his views of English politics were of the most limited kind; he participated in the eccentric Toryism of the Duke of Wellington, and sympathized with his ludicrous fears.

"I could almost gnaw the flesh off my bones," wrote Wellington to Malcolm, and Malcolm was scarcely less appalled by the success of the Reform Bill. Liberal and far-sighted in India, his mind was filled in England with the most melancholy prejudices and morbid alarms. Consequently, he drifted with the Tories for a session or two, and disappeared from Parliament without adding a tint to his already brilliant reputation. But a failure of this kind by no means discredited John Malcolm, wearing, as he did, the double crown of genius and virtue, the love of his friends, the admiration of England and of India. In both countries Chantrey's chisel prepared his effigy; in both countries he received rewards and praises which would have roused the pride of a less happily constituted nature. Without any pretensions to stoicism—without any disdain of advancement—indeed, with ambition prominent among his moral qualities—his aspirations, ardent as they were, contained no mixture of mean or extravagant vanity.

We have alluded to the statues of Malcolm by Chantrey. Not a less enduring memorial will be this life by Mr. Kaye. Mr. Kaye acquired a conspicuous reputation by his History of the Afghan War, and that reputation will be more than sustained by the work before us. To write Malcolm's biography was not an ordinary task. It was a prodigious labour of selection, arrangement, and compression, of analysis and narrative, the mass of materials being of embarrassing magnitude. They consisted of correspondence, family papers, and public documents of various kinds, with glimpses of personal recollection, and anecdotes saved from the meminiscent table-talk of Indian circles. Some very remarkable letters of the Duke of Wellington appear in these volumes for the first time, with others by Malcolm himself, which, in their way, are not less interesting and characteristic. In connexion with the Persian episodes we had expected to find some account of the correspondence between Malcolm and Captain Shee, who aided in drilling the Shah's army in Persia—a correspondence of considerable value, full of agreeable and instructive matter; but Mr. Kaye does not appear to have observed it. However, he was compelled to fix boundaries to his narration, ample as it is, and we can testify that there is not a superfluous page in the volumes. They illustrate very effectively the importance of that section of literature which is the link between the historical and the biographical. The life of Malcolm occupies a broad and lustrous page, not only in the annals of India, but in the biographies of other men, whom his encouragement and control, partly, conducted to distinction. Noble himself, he elicited the nobility of others. We cannot bring to mind any Indian diplomatist who would have been his

rival during the last negotiations with the Peishwa, the Mahratta prince, whose ambition and bad faith had, during a long series of years, disturbed and endangered India. That powerful and martial dynasty, which little more than half a century before, had arrayed two hundred thousand men on the plains of Parsiput, surrendered at the banks of the Nerbudda. Lord Hastings secured his own fame by ratifying the policy of his representatives, and Malcolm, in the Central States, proved how much may be done for the natives of Asia by an administrator at once resolute and cautious, acquainted with the people, and familiar with the science of government. What has recently been effected in the Punjab was effected by him in Malwa. The peasant no longer carried arms when he went to his plough. Those who know India will know what this implies. Years after, when Malcolm was the guest of the East India Company, at a banquet in honour of his appointment to the governorship of Bombay,—when Wellington, Canning, and Mackintosh, assembled to pronounce his eulogy,—when Wellington said, “the history of his life during thirty years, would be the history of the glory of his country in India,” his proudest recollections, his firmest hope of fame, were in connexion with the blessings of his rule in Malwa. The author of “The British Conquests in India,” describes these results: “The country came into our hands a desert—its towns in ruins, its villages destroyed, its soil uncultivated, its roads cut up, and myriads of its population swept off by famines, plagues, and battles. It is now rising to prosperity: it is becoming more thickly inhabited; its numerous streams are now fertilizing the plains; and, while its fortresses decay, cities and hamlets flourish, for the vital spring of a people’s happiness has been renewed.” (II. 79.) It rests with the public in England to exert a pressure on the government sufficiently powerful and sufficiently enlightened to render these words, which are applicable to some British Indian provinces, applicable to the whole of the British Indian empire, with its population of a hundred millions of souls.

The whole career of Sir John Malcolm proves that the European mind, when rightly educated, is fitted to meet the Eastern mind, in its peculiar moods, and to influence it for good or for evil in an unlimited degree.

The immediate ancestry of John Malcolm were the Eskdale Malcolms, a younger branch of the Malcolms of Lachore, in Fifeshire; they settled in Dumfriesshire, in 1717, on the estate of Burnfoot, a spot distinguished as picturesque amidst the picturesque landscapes in which Eskdale abounds. Disaster gloomed over the hitherto prosperous career of the Malcolm family in the fortunes of George Malcolm, who, having largely speculated,

saw, as the result, his estate encumbered with debt, and found himself compelled to sell the whole of his little property. Happily he had friends who proved themselves such in the hour of need. Of the sons of George and Margaret, all more or less distinguished hereafter in the public service, John was the fourth. He was born on the 2nd of May, 1769, and in childhood, it is said, evinced the mental and bodily activity which proved his predominating characteristic throughout life, the youthful phase of which was, a remarkable aptitude for mischief. Already, at the tender age of eleven, circumstances opened a path, which was for him the path of promise. A nomination to the military service of the East India Company for his son was offered to Mr. Malcolm, through the influence of Governor Johnstone. But the more direct means of his departure from home was the visit—to John a momentous one—of his uncle, Mr. John Pasley. This good man at once resolved on a practical preparation of his nephew for his subsequent duty in the world. An anecdote related of the boy shows that, from the fearlessness and resolution of his spirit, he was not ill-fitted to make his way in it. When on the morning of departure, his old nurse combing his hair, exclaimed; "Now, Jock, my mon, be sure when ye are awa ye kame your hair and keep your face clean; if ye dinna, ye'll just be sent hame again."—"Tut, woman," was the reply, "ye're aye se feared; ye'll see if I were awa amang strangers, I'll just do weel aneugh."

Accompanying his uncle to London, John was entrusted after a week of observation and marvel in the great metropolis, to scholastic discipline under the roof of Mr. Allen. His experience of it was brief; for, at twelve years of age, we follow him to the India House, as a candidate before the committee of directors! And now the undaunted bearing of the school-boy stood him in good stead; for, apparently on the eve of failure, a smart rejoinder ensured him the triumph he could be little expected, of course, to gain on account of any enlarged information or varied acquisitions at that early age. It proved, however, what was sufficient for the inquirer to know, and the candidate to possess—the capacity for acquisition and achievement hereafter. "Why, my little man," said one of the directors to him, "what would you do if you were to meet Hyder Ali?" "Do, sir," replied Malcolm, promptly, "I would out with my sword and cut off his head!" "You will do," was the rejoinder, "let him pass."

Malcolm's first commission was granted October, 1781. The interval of some months which elapsed before embarkation was spent in a studious industry, not without its benefit.

At the time of Malcolm's arrival in the Madras Presidency, the English were engaged in a twofold hostility with Tippoo,

the successor of Hyder Ali, and the French, whom they were besieging in their position at Cuddalore. The then disordered condition of our diplomatic and military force rendered welcome the peace which ensued with the French, and the pacific treaty with Tippoo, 1784. It contained an agreement for the release of the English prisoners. The escort of them into the security of British territory was allotted to Major Dallas, while a detachment was sent from the Mysorean frontier to meet it, the command of which was given to Malcolm as ensign. He was now fairly entered into the service he was destined so eminently to adorn. As the detachment met the escort, a bright-faced English boy riding on a rough pony towards them, was seen with surprise by Dallas. The inquiry naturally made by him was after the commanding officer; and his astonishment was a little increased, when Malcolm, with the supreme consciousness of newly-acquired dignity, replied, "*I* am the commanding officer."

Little material exists for the biography of Malcolm during the next few years, says Mr. Kaye;—sufficient, however, to afford us a graphic picture of the occupations, aspirations, and interests of a free-spirited, energetic, and ambitious young soldier. The vivacity of his disposition, the activity of his temperament, his frank and noble bearing, and the geniality of his manners, would not fail to make him beloved by his companions, while his accomplishments as a horseman, and in all manly exercises, awakened their admiration. But these very endowments and attractions, united with the ardour of his nature, exposed him the more sorely to the temptations besetting independent action at fourteen years of age; and his biographer, therefore, very judiciously refrains from claiming a pedestal on which to elevate his hero as a model of virtue. The result of his unrestrained actions was an immersion before long in debt. However, he avoided the worst result of such a position. His embarrassments never betrayed him into apathy or want of self-respect; but, through self-denial and diligence, he nobly resolved to smoothe the way again before him. This determination often cost him the want of a meal, which was the accidental cause of the colonel of the regiment sending for him one day. "I don't see any smoke come out of the chimney of your cook-room, Malcolm," said he; "come and breakfast with me." But the unwarrantable interference, as Malcolm thought it, aroused the idea of a challenge, which was penned, if not sent. Nevertheless, he was one of the most grateful of men; for a poor native woman in the bazaar, who benevolently supplied him with provisions, awaiting his convenience to pay, as she was

aware of his position, he never after forgot, but in more prosperous times pensioned her for the remainder of her life.

The end of the year 1780 found him honourably released from all liability through his own unaided exertions. A life of activity was open to his unfettered energy and his constant aspiration.

Two years later found the English, though but ill-prepared for the emergency, anticipating war, necessitated for the security of the Deccan against the reckless ambition of Tippoo. With the Nizam as our ally, the corps of Malcolm, now lieutenant, formed part of the auxiliary force. Malcolm's first campaign was well calculated to test his soldierly qualifications. A painful march from Ellore brought them, about the middle of July, into the Nizam's dominions. It is thus recorded by Malcolm to his friends:—

“We marched here about ten days ago. Our road was terrible—all rocks and deserts—in the hottest season that was perhaps ever known. The thermometer at 115 degrees for nearly a month. I walked nearly the whole way, as my horse was sick; and we frequently marched at twelve o'clock at night, and did not arrive at our ground till two P.M. next day. We were sometimes greatly distressed for provisions—often forty or fifty without any—but that was little compared with the want of water on the road. Officers in general supply themselves, and have a servant for the purpose; but, in some of our long marches, I have seen men raving mad, go into high fever, and die in a few hours.”—Vol. I. pp. 15, 16.

At Bhoortpore, Malcolm's detachment joined the army of the Nizam, which presented a curious motley of barbaric splendour and squalid incapacity. “With few exceptions,” says Malcolm, “a more complete set of ragamuffins was never assembled.” The absence of moral discipline was in proportion to the roughness of their external appearance, and their merciless conduct towards the inhabitants of their own provinces, and the countries through which they passed, made a deep impression on Malcolm. Every possible kind of torture, atrocity, and extortion was practised by them.

Six months were passed in besieging Copoulee, considered by Malcolm as the strongest fortress in India. At length it surrendered.

At this period it was that he conceived the desire for the diplomatic occupation which formed so important a part hereafter in his career. He became acquainted with Sir John Kennaway, the president, and other representatives of British rule at the Court of Hyderabad, which formed his introductory study of statecraft. To facilitate his ambition, Malcolm now

acquired proficiency in the Persian tongue, and turned his observation also more minutely to the people of the East, and their relations with British power.

Having joined Lord Cornwallis before Seringapatam, Malcolm's qualifications were speedily discerned by that nobleman, and his knowledge of the Persian tongue caused him to be selected as interpreter. But failing health necessitated relaxation for a time, and at the close of twelve arduous years, invaluable to Malcolm for the experience they had brought him, he returned to England. The joy of a family gathering, where all are united by the warmest attachment, can readily be imagined; but not the least interesting episodes in the eventful career of Malcolm are the rare and brief periods dedicated to the indulgence of the hallowed affections of home. These affections were retained by him in all their nobility and fervour to the close of life, of which ample proof was given in his correspondence—expressing sometimes the reverential gratitude of a son, at others the pleasant endearing tenderness of a brother.

On his return to the East, his next engagement was as a witness of the capture of the Cape. Still more ardently as time advanced was he absorbed in desire for the excitement of diplomatic action, and great was his satisfaction on receiving from Lord Wellesley an appointment as ambassador to the Court of Persia. Since the reign of Queen Elizabeth no envoy had proceeded thither, and the importance of the mission was now adequate to the value of the objects to be obtained. These were the security of India from the evils of Afghan invasion, and the desolation with which the descent of a horde of barbarians is connected. These were the more to be feared from the support they would most probably receive from the Mohammedan princes of India, who anticipated, through such an alliance, deliverance from the tyranny of Mahrattas and Feringhee. To aid in this alliance, and by union with the native powers to urge resistance to the British rule, was supposed to be the policy pursued by France, and this conviction probably was more powerful than any in prompting the course of English diplomacy under Lord Wellesley.

In November, then, Malcolm quitted Hyderabad, impressed with a profound contempt for the Court of the Nizam. A march of eighteen days brought him to Poonah, the Peishwa's capital. From thence his journey lay across a country remarkably beautiful in its scenery. But enamelled meadows and rich foliage had no charm for Malcolm, who confesses a total want of appreciation for the loveliness of nature. But this was com-

pensated by his ready sympathy with mankind, and the intercourse into which he so naturally entered through the possession of this quality, with the natives of India, was of use to him in a variety of ways. He found often information as well as amusement.

The first step towards the fulfilment of Malcolm's mission on his arrival at Muscat, was an interview with the governor of that place, favourably disposed towards the English policy. This frame of mind Malcolm took all possible pains to foster by an eloquent demonstration of the advantages to be derived from an alliance of the Persian and British powers; and, as a further incentive, recapitulated the triumphs and possessions of the English in India, and the benefits derived by the people from their rule. "From Surat to Calcutta not a vessel could anchor without the consent of the ruling power. What, then," he asked, "would become of the famed commerce of Muscat if the harbours of the whole Indian peninsula were closed against it." He was next received by the Imaum himself, "a man of a mild and prepossessing countenance, and of polite but simple manners." After a repetition of his proposals, Malcolm paused, and was asked by the Imaum, what else he had to state. On replying, nothing, the monarch, in Arabian fashion, placing his hand on his head, and then on his heart, declared that he entirely consented to the treaty.

Having effected so far his enterprise, Malcolm retired to Bushire, carrying with him, as usual, an ample supply of presents in the shape of jewelled watches, guns, telescopes, pistols, and enamelled ornaments. This system of presentation-offerings he found no less indispensable to the support of diplomacy than a rigorous adherence to the intricacies of Eastern etiquette; and while he found the latter insupportably tedious, the distribution of gifts was, doubtless, felt as a pleasure; prompting him, perhaps, in the generosity of his nature, to a degree of prodigality. Moreover, he had the most honourable incentives to liberality in the conviction that, finally, it would best secure the interests of his country; and, as its representative, he desired as much as possible to realize the idea of its splendour and importance. But, while he wisely conceded much to the peculiar tenacity of habit in the East which renders innovation so difficult, he exacted unflinchingly the respect and consideration due to him as the agent of a great European power, and on no account would brook the slightest deviation from the demand. On one occasion having suffered, as he thought, a breach of courtesy from the Persian prince, he demanded ample atonement, or declared his intention at once to depart from Shiraz, and report the outrage to the king. But, before

measures could be taken to that effect, a most humble apology was tendered. In no respect was the policy of Malcolm so admirable as in the rare combination it displayed of moderation with firmness of purpose, which extended peacefully and more surely the British sway by desisting from the contemptuous treatment of cherished rights, and the violation of a people's privilege.

From Shiraz the mission proceeded to Ispahan, and thence to Teheran, where the Envoy was presented to the Persian monarch, who received him in a lofty chamber, profusely ornamented, in one corner of which sat the monarch, magnificently attired, and who, seated on his cushioned throne, appeared a dazzling mass of jewelled brilliance. A gracious welcome was accorded him,—the affability of the monarch somewhat increased by the splendid array of presents laid at his feet. Watches glittering with jewels, caskets of gold beautifully enamelled, lustres of variegated glass,—the ingenious marvels of European science and skill,—precious stones, a diamond of great worth, and mirrors of colossal proportions, awaited his acceptance! His Majesty expressed himself curious as to the customs of the English court,—inquiring how many wives had King George. With the aid of such courtesies, diplomacy proceeded apace; and the treaties appeared on the point of a satisfactory settlement. But the ambassador's endurance had still to be tried, for after an interminable amount of negotiation, discussion, modification and surrender, the two treaties drawn up by the Persian ministers, were presented to Malcolm, but so “altered and mutilated as to have lost their original form!” This necessitated amendment and delay. Delighted, he at length took his leave of the Persian capital, and emerged for awhile from the entanglements of a diplomatic embassy to Persia. It had been an anxious and arduous task; but his success was all that could be hoped, and far more than might reasonably be expected in dealing with the craftiness and unscrupulous duplicity of an Eastern court.

The next capacity in which we see Malcolm is as private secretary to the Marquis Wellesley, who in every difficulty sought his aid and appreciated it; and during one of his many expeditions, Malcolm was detained as prisoner in the village of Keroli. But, so far from being discomforted by the incident, he regarded it rather as a pleasurable adventure, as he contrived, through some means, to acquaint the Resident of Poonah with his situation. The incident is pleasantly recorded by him:—

“I found myself” he says, “in a small village whose inhabitants were of the Mahratta tribe. They were buried among the undulations of wooded eminence at the top of the ghauts, and seemed, though only three or four miles from the great road between Poonah and Bombay, in a great degree out of the busy world, and exempt

from those cares to which their neighbours were exposed. Before two hours of the morning had passed, I was acquainted with the whole village. They had, none of them, except one man, who had been a tappal-peon, or post-office runner, to the post-office at Bombay, ever seen a European before. . . . The inhabitants of the hamlet hardly knew the names of the chiefs who were wasting the plains in their vicinity with fire and sword. They paid, they said, a trifle of rent to the lord of the country. They had, they told me, and they thanked God for it, no fields to be trampled. Their sole wealth was in their cattle and sheep, which, on the slightest alarm, were driven into the recesses of the hills. Their huts offered no temptation to plunderers, and, therefore, they were never plundered. The diet on which they principally lived was milk. What rice they had was bought by the sale of sheep or butter. They had, besides, a quantity of poultry, whose eggs were sold at the neighbouring villages to passing travellers. I never saw a more marked difference of character and habits than there appeared between the inmates of this retired village and those upon the high road and in the open country. And though nothing could happen more disagreeable than my detention, there was a novelty and simplicity of manners in my new friends which quite pleased me, and the two days I passed with them I have ever since remembered with satisfaction. I had made such advances in the good opinion of all ranks by talking to them, laughing with them, distributing a few rupees among the men, giving a silk handkerchief to the potail's (head man) wife, and a few pieces of sugar-candy to the children, that I found on the second day all were prepared to express their gratitude by giving me an entertainment. The place of assembly was an open *pandal*, or rude canopy, in front of the potail's hut, which was made with a slight, neat roof, and four bamboo posts. Under the shade of the *pandal*, some men began the ball with a shepherd's dance; next the little children, male and female, gave us two dances—the sheep dance and the fowl dance. In the former, they ran and skipped about on all fours, and bleated like the animals they imitated. In the second, they sat upon their thighs, and putting their right hand over their head to imitate the beak of a fowl, they hopped about and pecked at one another in a very ludicrous and amusing manner.

“But the important part of the entertainment was now announced. A small crowd opened to the right and left, and showed the tappal-peon attired as an English lady. If the dress of this post-office runner, which consisted of a piece of old muslin made into a cap or bonnet, a common white cloth which was tied at the sleeves and waist to look like a gown, and bulged out at each side with some sticks to make a hooped petticoat, was ludicrous, his dancing was still more so. He began by walking slowly up and down, which I concluded was meant as a minuet. During the ceremony, for such I fancy the spectators thought it, all were grave; and I felt compelled to seem the same. But the period of sufferance was not long; for in an instant the imitator of English manners began to sing, *La, la, la—Tol, lol de rol*; and danced, and jumped, and whisked about

in every direction. At the country dance, for such it was intended, all laughed, and expressed their admiration by loud plaudits. I joined the general voice. The old tappal-man, when it was over, came to me and said, 'It is now nearly thirty years since I looked in at the door and saw these fine dances; I wanted to teach them to the people here, but they have no sense and cannot learn.'"

The most gratifying testimony to Malcolm's exertions continued to be afforded from those whose position enabled them best to understand and appreciate his services, and, consequently, rendered their approbation the source of a peculiar satisfaction. The Duke of Wellington thus addresses him in 1824:—

"I can answer no great transaction has taken place in the East, in which you have not played a principal, most useful, conspicuous, and honourable part; and you have, in many services, diplomatic as well as military, been distinguished by successes, any one of which, in ordinary circumstances, would have been deemed sufficient for the life of a man, and would have recommended him to the notice of his superiors."

The repulsion of the Mahratta power was the next important object for which we had to contend, and the victory obtained by the troops of Holkar over the Peishwa, by driving him to seek a closer alliance with the English, was propitious to that end. The treaty, therefore, with the Peishwa, known as the Treaty of Bassein, was concluded in 1802. Shortly after, Malcolm was appointed to the Residency of Mysore, a post of a peculiarly important character at that juncture.

A force was already assembled on the Mysore frontier, and another division under General Wellesley was about to take the field for the restoration of Peishwa to his capital. While Malcolm recruited his health at Bombay, tidings reached him of the victory of Wellesley at Assaye; a victory in which, Malcolm declared, he should regret to the end of his life, he had not been enabled to share. A repetition of triumphs proved a favourable period in which to treat with the defeated Mahrattas, and Sir John Malcolm's next expedition was to the Court of Scindia.

"We were well received," he writes to General Wellesley, "by the Maharajah, who is a good-looking young man. He preserved great gravity when we first came in, and probably we might have left him without seeing that his gravity was affected, had not a ridiculous incident moved his muscles. A severe shower took place while we were in the tent, under which Mr. Pepper was seated, when all at once it burst in a torrent upon his head. From the midst of the torrent we heard a voice exclaim "Jesus!" and soon after poor Pepper emerged. The Maharajah laughed loudly, and we all joined in chorus."

Contentions and intrigues abounded in the Mahratta court,

and the anxieties and perplexities of statesmanship were felt in all their force by Malcolm. It was difficult to draw the attention of the Maharajah to negotiation, equally difficult to make him comply with the necessary terms, and still more so to rely upon his promises when made. Malcolm was imbued with the deepest sense of the responsibility imposed upon him, and the errors imputed to him could not, even by his enemies, be attributed to negligence or apathy. Nevertheless, his course of policy did not meet with the approbation of General Wellesley. The displeasure, however, was but temporary, and was entirely effaced by the explanations of Malcolm.

It was during a residence at Lucknow that the intelligence of an event, to Malcolm of momentous interest, reached him—the appointment of Lord Cornwallis as the successor of General Wellesley. His regret at the occurrence was awakened by the personal attachment to Wellesley which he united to the admiration he entertained for his policy; and this regret was heightened by the reasonable anticipation, knowing the feelings of the Government, that the same policy would scarcely be pursued by his successor, and the idea of a retrograde movement was abhorrent to a mind so energetic. By Lord Cornwallis equal apprehension was experienced lest he should not meet with his cordial co-operation. The situation of Malcolm at this period was sufficiently embarrassing, as he discovered that not only vigorous measures would be dispensed with, but that the absolute abandonment of our alliances and our territory was the course to be adopted by the new governor-general. To assist such a policy was to do violence to his conscience and his principles, and to labour to undo all that he had sought to acquire through the diligence of former years.

The death of Lord Cornwallis relieved him from the distraction of doubt into which he had been plunged; and he at once proffered his services to Sir George Barlow. The lapse of years saw him still occupied assiduously and honourably in the furtherance of the cause to which he had dedicated the energies of his existence. An enlightened statesman, a distinguished soldier, an able administrator, he proved himself adequate to every emergency. Prompt in action, fertile in expedient, and fearless in authority, though mindful of responsibility, the results of his beneficent influence were as remarkable as they were honourable. Of this, the most sufficient as well as gratifying testimony was afforded in the enthusiastic affection and respect manifested by all classes when, in later times, crowned with honours, he completed the circuit of the Residencies.

It was now that Malcolm had achieved the crowning work of his life—the political organization of Central India. We have

already alluded to the effects of this remarkable settlement. But he said that Ireland was conquered less by English arms than by English law. A similar remark might be applied to India. It is a region where, more than in any other, conciliation is an overpowering influence. Malcolm understood this maxim, and applied it. The result was honourable to his foresight, to his energy, and to his discretion. He left in Central India a reputation which will not soon die away. If we refrain from discussing in detail the policy he adopted with so much success, it is because justice could not be done to his skill and perseverance without a minute enumeration of facts, which would lead us beyond our limits. After all, the events of Sir John Malcolm's youth are those which chiefly fascinate an English reader. We see the seed sown and the harvest ripening. In later years we accompany Malcolm to England; we notice his correspondence with the various members of Lord Liverpool's government, his receipts of rewards and honours, his Bombay administration—distinguished by acts of great moral courage, as well as by an extraordinary knowledge of Indian necessities. Then, once more, we return with him to England, where, in the fulness of years, with the energies of a young man, and the prejudices of a superannuated agriculturist, he re-enters Parliament, fights on behalf of the failing Tory faction, is struck off the rolls of the House by the Reform Bill; and, retiring into private life, dies the calm death of a Christian. His ambition had been fulfilled, so far as could moderately have been expected; and if some projects had failed, and some honours had been denied to his aspiring hopes, he felt, upon his death-bed, that he had received, in this world, all that he could reasonably desire. The nation felt its loss when John Malcolm died. There was a universal testimony to his greatness and virtue. But, we repeat, until Mr. Kaye's volumes appeared, not even Chantrey's sculpture had constituted a fitting memorial of such a man.

ART. V.—THE HERMETIC PHILOSOPHY.

L'Alchimie et Les Alchimistes : Essai Historique et Critique sur La Philosophie Hermétique. Par Louis Figuier. Deuxième Edition, revue et augmentée. Paris : 1856.

ALTHOUGH it is now almost universally admitted that the pursuit of the philosopher's stone was a vain and pernicious delusion, the offspring of imperfect knowledge, false conceptions,

and excited fancies—that the golden vision which, age after age, gleamed before the eyes of the philosophers of Europe, was unreal as the mirage that mocks the thirsty pilgrim, and bright and deceitful as those wandering fires that sometimes mislead the traveller—still it must, at the same time, be acknowledged that the belief in man's ability to discover for himself a substance, which should at once be capable of converting the viler metals into silver and gold, of supplying an infallible remedy for all diseases, and of prolonging life far beyond its natural limits, though but a dream, was the most magnificent that has ever dazzled the human imagination. During a period of more than a thousand years it fascinated some of the wisest of mankind, and, even in the nineteenth century, its allurements have not entirely departed. Alchemy, indeed, unfolds to us a most interesting chapter in the history of human error and credulity; while the lives and opinions of its votaries present a strange combination of strength and weakness, wisdom and folly, illusion and reality, truth and falsehood. They sought what could not be found, and found what they did not seek. Many a valuable drug and chemical, many a substance useful in the arts, was discovered by these old and earnest searchers, in the course of their long and laborious pursuit of the golden phantom that ever lured them onwards, yet always eluded their grasp. They were the pioneers of modern science, the unconscious founders of the splendid edifice of modern chemistry; and the opinion which would condemn all their labours as vain and ridiculous, upon many points is false, upon almost all exaggerated. On this account, therefore, as well as from its being the least known department of the history of the sciences, although it occupied so prominent a place in the Middle Ages and during the revival of letters, the science of Alchemy well deserves a careful and unprejudiced consideration; and this it has met with in the learned and entertaining volume of M. Figuier, some account of which we shall now proceed to place before our readers.

His book is divided into four parts. The first of these is devoted to a statement of the opinions and doctrines maintained by the Hermetic philosophers, including a sketch of the labours undergone by them in their search after the philosopher's stone, and a summary of the principal chemical discoveries which are due to them. In the second part, an attempt is made to determine the influence which Alchemy has exercised upon society during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the two epochs in which it exerted the most powerful sway over the human mind. The third part, entitled "History of the Principal Metallic Transmutations," contains a detail of the strange events which

have contributed to keep up, for so long a time, throughout Europe a belief in the doctrines of Alchymical science; and the last part, "Alchymy in the Nineteenth Century," has for its aim to demonstrate that, even in our own day, Alchymical beliefs have not been entirely abandoned, and to state distinctly the arguments which some persons yet rely upon, as their justification for still adhering to them.

The following are the general conclusions at which M. Figuier arrives:—

"The present state of the science of chemistry prevents us from considering the transmutation of metals as an impossibility; it results from recently discovered scientific data, and from the actual spirit and tendency of chemistry, that the transformation of one metal into another might be accomplished. But history shows us that, up to the present day, no one has succeeded in realizing the fact of metallic transmutation."

During the long period of twelve centuries, the great object of chemistry was the changing of inferior metals into gold and silver; and it was not until the sixteenth century that some enlightened philosophers endeavoured to rear up a barrier between Alchymy—the pretended art of the gold-makers—and chemistry, considered as a separate science, apart from and independent of any special or private aim. Some writers have endeavoured to trace the origin of Alchymy to Tubal Cain, and others to the Egyptian Hermes Trismegistus; but these are mere fanciful and baseless conjectures, for there are no written documents relating to Alchymical science which ascend higher than the fourth century of the Christian era. These belong to the *litterati* of the Byzantine empire, among whom it seems extremely probable that Alchymy had its origin. About that period it was common to regard Egypt as having been the cradle of all human knowledge; and, in order to lend the sanction of a great name to their works, some of the Byzantine authors had the audacity to attribute them to the great Hermes himself; but it is easy to see from the style, the writing, and the paper of many of these MSS., which still exist in various European libraries, that the pen of Hermes has been in reality guided by the hands of a Christian monk. These Byzantine philosophers were on intimate terms with those of Alexandria, and both pursued Alchymical researches with equal ardour. In the seventh century, however, the Arab invasion of Egypt for a time suspended the studies of the sages of Alexandria; but this proved only a temporary check, for the conquerors soon surpassed the conquered in the eagerness with which they devoted themselves to the study of Alchymy. In the eighth century they carried it, along with their victorious arms, into Spain,

which speedily became the chief centre of the Hermetical philosophy. In that country the precious jewel of the sciences was preserved, from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, amidst surrounding darkness and ignorance; and the few learned men who were to be found in other parts of Europe, repaired to the schools of Cordova, Seville, or Toledo, to imbibe the lessons of wisdom from the lips of Mahomedan sages. From them Arnold of Villanova, Thomas Aquinas, Raymond Lully, and Roger Bacon, acquired a fondness for Alchymical studies; their renown and writings contributed to diffuse Hermetic science throughout Europe; and to such an extent did its doctrines spread, that, in the sixteenth century, Alchymy was cultivated throughout the length and breadth of Christendom. The seventeenth century was its culminating point; from that era it has rapidly declined, its decay and downfall being precipitated by the extravagance, follies, and frauds of some of its most celebrated votaries. From that period, also, dates the schism which gave rise to modern chemistry. The struggle between the true and the pretended science was long and obstinate, and was not finally decided until after the memorable reformation brought about in chemical science by the genius of Lavoisier.

A false theory with regard to the composition of metals lay at the foundation of Alchymy. The doctrine of transmutation rested upon two principles, constantly dwelt upon in the writings of the Alchymists. These were the theories of metallic composition and generation. According to the Hermetical philosophers, the metals were composite bodies, and their composition was uniform; that is to say, they were all formed by the union of the two elements of *sulphur* and *mercury*, and the different properties of the metals were supposed to be the result of the various proportions of these two essential elements. According to them, gold was formed of a great deal of very pure mercury, united with a small quantity of very pure sulphur, and copper of a nearly equal proportion of these two ingredients. It must, however, be remembered that the sulphur and mercury, the elemental parts of all metallic substances, were in no respect identical with the sulphur and mercury of ordinary speech. The *mercurius* of the Alchymists signified that peculiar metallic base or element which imparts to metals their brilliancy and ductility; or, in a word, their metalleity; while sulphur was considered as their combustible element. Such, then, was the Hermetical theory of the composition of metals, one effect of which was to produce a belief in the possibility of transmutation; for, supposing that precisely the same elements entered into the composition of all metals, it would naturally follow that, if by proper means the proportions of these elements could be

made to vary, the substance of one metal might be changed into the substance of another. Mercury might become silver, or lead, gold. It is not known who was the author of this remarkable theory, generally received until the middle of the sixteenth century. The first writer who mentions it is the Arabian philosopher Geber, in the eighth century; but he does not claim it as his own. With regard to the generation of metals, it was considered to be, in all respects, similar to that of animals. The generation of the vile metals, such as lead, copper, and tin, was viewed as an accident or defect of nature. For it was believed that as she uniformly endeavours to give to her works the utmost degree of perfection, so, in the case of metals, she must be constantly tending to the production of gold; the generation of other metals being only the result of an accidental derangement. It was a fundamental principle with the Alchemists, that the metals, and in general all inorganic bodies, were endowed with a sort of vitality. The nobility or vileness of a metal was estimated by its mutability or the reverse. Thus gold and silver, unalterable in the fire and by the majority of chemical agents, were deemed the noblest and most perfect metals; while lead, copper, and tin, easily alterable or oxydizable, were considered as vile and imperfect. These vile metals were, however, believed to be in a sort of transition state, tending to pass into gold or silver, and to be influenced in this process by the action of the stars. Some Alchemists asserted that, once arrived at the state of gold or silver, a metal remained stationary, while others insisted that change was constantly going on, and that, after having attained the state of silver or gold, by a further mutation the metal relapsed gradually into a state of imperfection. Such were some of the strange doctrines of the Alchymical philosophers; one consequence of which was to establish, in principle, the possibility of metallic transmutations. It remained, however, to establish it experimentally, and to this all their energies were unceasingly devoted. They believed that there did exist a substance whose discovery would enable them to realize their golden dreams. This substance was the philosopher's stone, or powder, known also as the great *magisterium*, the great elixir, and the quintessence. When perfect, it changed viler metals into gold when placed in contact with them in a state of fusion; if, however, it had not obtained its highest degree of strength or perfection, it only transmuted them into silver; and, in this state, was termed the little philosopher's stone, the little elixir, or the little *magisterium*.

The philosopher's stone is met with for the first time in writings of the twelfth century. Before that period the Greek

and Arabian Alchymists, with the exception of Geber, had contented themselves with endeavouring to establish theoretically the doctrine of transmutation, without pointing out any special agent calculated to accomplish that object. The Hermetic philosophers differ greatly in their descriptions of the appearance and substance of this wonderful stone. Van Helmont says, "I have seen and made the philosopher's stone; it had the colour of saffron in powder, and was heavy, and sparkling like glass." Paracelsus represents it as a solid body of a dark red colour, transparent and flexible, but brittle as glass. Berigard of Pisa attributes to it the colour of a wild poppy, and the smell of calcined sea salt. Raymond Lully speaks of it under the name of *carbunculus*; Helvetius asserts that it has the colour of sulphur, while many other Alchymical authors describe it as a red powder. Strange inconsistencies these, but easily reconciled by an adept. Thus the well-known Alchymist who writes under the name of Kalid, says of the philosopher's stone, "it unites in itself all colours, it is white, red, yellow, green, azure." The little philosopher's stone, on the other hand, which, as before mentioned, only possessed the power of changing the vile metals into silver, is always spoken of as a substance of a brilliant white colour. It is, however, but seldom spoken of in the writings of the adepts, who loved not to do things by halves.

The Alchymists attributed to the philosopher's stone three essential properties; the changing of the viler metals into silver and gold, the curing of all diseases, and the prolonging of human life beyond its natural limits. But, although all of them are agreed as to its power of changing other metals into gold, there is a remarkable discrepancy among them as to the proportions necessary to be employed to produce this transmutation. The Alchymists of the seventeenth century are comparatively moderate in their pretensions; Kunckel, the most modest among them, calculates that it will convert into gold but twice its own weight of baser metal, and another author of the same period, from thirty to fifty times. But in the Middle Ages the pretensions of the adepts were far more extravagant; thus, Arnold of Villanova and Rupecissa, attribute to the grand magisterium the power of changing into gold 100 times its weight of impure metal; Roger Bacon, 100,000 times; Isaac the Hollander, 1,000,000; while Raymond Lully goes far beyond the highest of these computations. According to him, the philosopher's stone possesses such innate virtue, that not only will it change mercury into gold, but also impart to the gold thus made its own transmuting power:—

"Take" (says he, in his "Novum Testamentum") "of that exquisite medicine the size of a haricot bean, project it upon 1000 ounces of

mercury, it will change it into a red powder; add an ounce of this red powder to another 1000 ounces of mercury, a similar transformation will take place. Repeat twice this operation, and each ounce of the product will change 1000 ounces of mercury into philosopher's stone. An ounce of the product of the fourth operation will be sufficient to change 1000 ounces of mercury into gold purer than the best gold of the mines."

It would seem difficult to surpass the extravagance of this, but Salmon, another of the adepts, has succeeded in doing so. He asserts that, "at each contact with mercury, the powder of projection increases its power tenfold; and so on, always increasing, even to infinity,—a thing which the human spirit cannot comprehend."

The property of curing all maladies and prolonging life, was not attributed to the philosopher's stone until the thirteenth century; and this belief in its vital powers probably arose from the Western Alchymists misinterpreting the metaphorical and inflated language of their Eastern and more ancient brethren. Thus, when Geber says, "Bring me the six lepers that I may cleanse them;" he means to say, "Bring me the six vile metals that I may change them into gold." But, however this may be, the later Hermetical writers agree in holding the philosopher's stone, taken internally, to be the most precious and infallible of all medicines, by whose use a man may live out all the days of his appointed term in perfect health. Basil Valentine says, "that he who possesses the philosopher's stone will never be attacked by sickness or infirmities, until the last hour which has been assigned to him by the King of Heaven." But all the adepts were not content with limiting the powers of this medicine to the prolonging of life, in unbroken health and vigour, to the extreme of its natural limits. Artephius claimed for himself 1000 years of age; 400 were attributed to the Venetian Frederic Gualdo, a brother of the Rosy Cross; 140 to the Hermit Trautmansdorf, and more than 100 to Alain de Lisle, all owing to the use of this invaluable medicine. Raymond Lully, at an advanced age, was said to have been restored to youth and vigour by the same means; and Solomon Trismosin, another of the adepts, boasted that he possessed the power of restoring the freshness and beauty of youth to women of seventy and eighty years of age; and that for him to prolong life to the day of judgment was "a mere bagatelle." Vincent de Beauvais has attempted to show that Noah's having children when 500 years old, was owing to the possession of the philosopher's stone; and two English adepts have written elaborate treatises to prove that it was owing to the use of the same means that the Patriarchs attained their prolonged term of existence.

But besides these material opinions with regard to the philosopher's stone, there were others characterized by a mystical and theosophical tendency; and the works of the Hermetic adepts, generally considered, will be found to arrange themselves into two great groups; the one in some degree practical, recording the results of observation, and the experiments and toil of the laboratory, while the other is principally abstract, mystical, and speculative. The works included under this last group, do not date farther back than the twelfth century. The Arabs and Moors had applied themselves to the study of facts, without troubling themselves with metaphysical abstractions; but, once established in Christendom, Alchymy was not long in acquiring a new and more transcendental character. Religious inspiration was judged indispensable to the success of the great work, and the metaphysical and religious soon claimed for itself a superiority over the practical part of the art,—a result brought about by the writings of some of the most eminent philosophers of the time. The philosopher's stone was supposed to possess a mysterious and occult influence over the faculties of the human mind; and the grand operation of transmutation was frequently compared to the peculiar relations of the soul and body, and to the mysteries of the Christian religion. Up to the thirteenth century, Alchymists had been content to limit the powers of the philosopher's stone to the three dynamical properties previously mentioned, but after that era a moral influence was also imputed to it. It was supposed to confer upon its fortunate possessor, not only wealth, but also wisdom and virtue. As it ennobled the viler metals, so it purified the human spirit, and eradicated from the soul the bitter root of sin. As a consequence of these opinions, it was believed that the ancient sages had possessed the philosopher's stone; that Adam had received it from the hands of God, and that the Hebrew Patriarchs and King Solomon, were adepts initiated into the innermost mysteries of the Hermetic art; while some even went so far as to affirm that God has promised the philosopher's stone to all good Christians, quoting in support of their opinion that verse of the Apocalypse, "To him that overcometh, I will give a white stone."

The mediæval Alchymists were fond of assimilating the operation of transmutation to the death and resurrection of the body; and, in some of the Hermetic authors of this period, the resurrection is spoken of as an Alchymical operation—as a transmutation of a higher order. This idea pleased the great Luther, and conciliated his protection for Alchymical science, "on account of the magnificent comparisons which it presents to us, with the resurrection of the dead and the day of judgment." The com-

parison, or rather the identification of the Hermetic work with the mysteries of the Christian religion, is constantly to be met with in the writings of the mystics of the seventeenth century; in the works of Argill, of Michaëlis, and especially in those of Boehme, whose fanaticism contributed to give a powerful impulse and extensive circulation to his fantastic opinions. The adepts of this period believed the Divine favour to be necessary for the attainment of the philosopher's stone, and that it would be denied to those of a wicked life, or who neglected to implore the favour and assistance of the Deity. Many of them were men of blameless life, and of most sincere piety; but, in spite of the numerous proofs which they gave of their devotional fervour, and of the strength and orthodoxy of their faith, they were constantly reproached with devoting themselves to the study of magic, and invoking its assistance for the accomplishment of their work. It will, however, be found, upon a close examination, that magic really played a far less prominent part in the Hermetic philosophy than is generally supposed. The Byzantine adepts, indeed, were believers in the power of astrological influences, and named the metals after certain planets; thus, to Saturn, they consecrated lead, litharge, agate, and other similar materials; to Jupiter, tin, coral, sandarach, and sulphur; to Mars, iron, the loadstone, and pyrites; to Venus, copper, pearls, amethysts, asphalte, sugar, honey, myrrh, and sal-ammoniac; to Mercury, quicksilver, the emerald, amber, and mastic; and to the Moon, then numbered among the planets, silver and glass.

The Egyptians and Arabs, also, who had received from the Hebrews the traditions of the Cabala, conformed themselves to its principles, and held that a knowledge of astrology was necessary for a proper understanding and successful practice of the Hermetical art. This belief was promulgated by Geber and Rhasis in the eighth century, but their works belong to a very early era in Alchymical science; and, in later times, when the search after the philosopher's stone was transferred to the West, the astrological and magical parts of the process were generally abandoned, and fell into great discredit. Some distinguished adepts, such as Paracelsus, Arnold of Villanova, and Basil Valentine, did, indeed, turn their attention to astrology and magic; but, upon the whole, it may be safely affirmed that, although the Western Alchymists were, to a certain extent, impressed by the prevalent ideas of their time with regard to the nature and influence of supernatural beings, these ideas exercised but a feeble impression upon their works. History shows us that magic has played a very secondary

part in the Hermetical philosophy. In the various accounts of metallic transmutations which have come down to us, no mention is anywhere made of invocations to occult intelligences; and, although the history of Alchymical science points out to us certain individuals who toiled to conjure demons, or who boasted of retaining familiars in their service, the event proved that they were but false adepts and unworthy Alchymists. Such were Bragadino, Léonard Thurneysser, and François Borri, three charlatans, whose lives afford striking examples of human credulity and imposture. In fact, the reproach of magic so generally urged against the Alchymists, has been brought upon them by a few miserable pretenders; none of the great men, whose renown gilds the annals of Alchymy, ever believed or practised such folly. Whatever were the errors into which they fell, they were at least positive philosophers, having a determinate aim, and thoroughly knowing what was the object of their researches. To them magic was useless; and, if they were sometimes tempted to have recourse to its aid, their good sense soon showed them that no satisfactory result could be hoped for from the employment of such means.

The obscurity of the Hermetic writings has been often and justly complained of; and, in most instances, this obscurity appears to be wilful; it was their intention to be mysterious and impenetrable. Never having succeeded in the art of making gold, they could have nothing distinct or definite to say of its practice; but they themselves assigned a very different reason, namely, their fear of producing a complete revolution in the framework of society. "It would not be proper," says Salmon, "to profane and render public so precious a thing which, if it were known, would cause a prodigious disorder and overthrow in human society." The adepts also, considering the philosopher's stone to be a Divine gift peculiar to the elect, and to those spirits whom grace has touched, believed that it would not be lawful to communicate such a secret to the wicked, or to the vulgar crowd, and therefore shrouded their writings in mystery, holding that temporal and eternal punishment awaited the profane wretch who should rashly reveal the grand secret. Of this, it would be easy to cite abundant proofs, but the obscurity of these writings, and the fancifulness of their contents, is sufficiently indicated by the titles of some of the most celebrated among them. Such are "The Chymical Apocalypse" and "The Twelve Keys of Philosophy," by Basil Valentine; "The Mirror of Secrets" and "The Alchymical Honey" of Roger Bacon; "The Collar Bone" of Raymond Lully; "The Book of Light," by Rupecissa; "The Tomb of Semiramis opened to Wise Men," and "The Entrance Opened to the Shut Palace of the

King," by Philalethes ; "The Tincture of the Sun and Moon ;" "The Glorious Sun in the Chymical Firmament of the German Horizon ;" and many others equally absurd and magniloquent.

It must be remembered that the Alchymists believed that metals were produced in the same way as organized bodies—that they were generated by the union of the male and female ; and their science consisted in bringing about artificially the union of the two powers necessary for the production of gold. These first essentials were then left for a certain time in a vase, designated from its form "The Philosopher's Egg," in which, after a sufficient period had elapsed, the perfect metal was expected to be found. But, it may be asked, what are these two substances that play so important a part in metallic generation ? According to the best authorities, they are ordinary gold which represents the male organ, and "the mercury of philosophers," also termed "the first agent," which represents the female. The grand difficulty consists in procuring this mercury ; that once found, all is simple, but its discovery is no easy task, requiring either an immediate Divine revelation, or the friendship of an adept, who has himself so received it. This essential element has been sought in various and most dissimilar substances ; in arsenic, mercury, and antimony ; in salts (for which the passage in St. Luke, "salt is good," was cited as an authority), such as sea salt, saltpetre, and vitriol ; in plants and animals ; in bones, flesh, blood, urine, and excrements ; in virgin soil, in rain water, and in dew-drops fallen upon roses. Such were the follies into which the Alchymists, once launched upon a wide sea of extravagance, soon found themselves hurried ; starting from a principle whose correctness they had taken for granted, they pushed their conclusions to the verge of insanity.

The researches of the Alchymical mystics were directed to the discovery of the Alcahest, the Palingenesy, and the Homunculus. Palingenesy was the art of making plants revive from their ashes, and the Homunculus was a miniature man, fabricated by Hermetic art ; whilst the Alcahest was the universal solvent, supposed to be capable of reducing all substances to the liquid form. It was not sought after until the sixteenth century, and Paracelsus is the first author who alludes to it. Repeated attempts were made to discover it until the middle of the eighteenth century, when their futility and absurdity were exposed by Kunckel, who made the very simple and obvious remark, which, however, seems to have escaped every one for 200 years, that, if the Alcahest had ever existed, it would have been quite impossible to preserve it, as, possessing the power of

dissolving all substances, it would necessarily have dissolved the vessel which contained it.*

There is one point of view from which the labours of the Alchymists, in spite of their many aberrations and follies, may be regarded with pleasure, and examined with advantage, and from which they are seen to have the strongest claims upon our gratitude and admiration. Viewed in connexion with their influence upon modern chemical science, they will be found to have been equally useful and important. The Alchymists were the first to make use of the experimental method in philosophy, that is to say, of observation and induction as applied to scientific research. So far back as the eighth century the Arabian Geber put in practice the rules of the inductive philosophy, of which Galileo and Lord Bacon developed the laws 800 years afterwards; and, in the thirteenth century, Roger Bacon, by the use of the same method in his physical researches, was led to the most astonishing discoveries. Thus, the Alchymists were the forerunners and pioneers of the positive philosophy, by making the interpretation of phenomena rest upon the careful examination of facts, and, in this way, breaking through the metaphysical fetters that had so long held the human mind in bondage. And this may be fully admitted without at all detracting from the well-earned fame of those great men who accomplished the mighty scientific revolutions of the seventeenth century; for the researches of the Alchymists occupied but a narrow field, and gave birth to no school of philosophy. They, indeed, made experiments, often most costly, elaborate, and long-continued, but they were ignorant of the benefits of the inductive method as a mighty engine for the discovery of truth; and, therefore, cannot claim the discovery of that great system which, ages afterwards, was destined to revolutionize the world. But it is difficult to overrate the services which they rendered in preparing the elements necessary for the creation of chemistry; compelled by the direction of their researches to study attentively the nature and action of simple and composite bodies, they succeeded in collecting an immense mass of valuable facts, and these observations, the results of fifteen centuries of labour,

* Fluorine, an element discovered by modern chemistry, almost realizes the properties of the long-sought Alcahest. It enters into the composition of Derbyshire spar, and, for a long time, no vessel could be found to resist the intensity of its chemical action in a separate state. At length the idea occurred to two brothers of the name of Knox, that vessels formed of fluor-spar, a substance already saturated with fluorine, might answer the purpose of holding this modern Alcahest, and their experiments proved to a great extent successful.

constitute the materials of that imposing temple of chemical science whose strength and harmony we now admire.

A rapid glance over the discoveries of the most distinguished masters of the Hermetic art, will enable us to form some conception of the important services which they have rendered to modern chemistry and its cognate sciences. Geber, one of the most ancient of their number, was the first to describe precisely our ordinary metals, and he has also left remarks of great distinctness and value upon sulphur and arsenic. He points out the mode of preparing nitric and nitro-muriatic acids, the action of the former upon metals, and that of the latter upon gold, silver, and sulphur. He also describes several important chemicals, such as caustic, corrosive sublimate, red precipitate, and many others. In the succeeding century (the ninth), the Arab Rhases discovered the preparation of brandy, and of several other alcoholic compounds; and was also the first to mention orpiment, realgar, borax, certain sulphates of iron and copper, and various mercurial salts. Rhases conducted the scientific studies prosecuted at Bagdad, the capital of the eastern Caliphate, and used every exertion to give them a practical and experimental direction. "The mysteries of the chemical art," he tells us, "reveal themselves only by dint of labour and perseverance; but what a triumph when man can succeed in raising a corner of that veil which covers the face of nature."

Albert the Great describes the caustic potash now in use in our laboratories; the cupellation, that is, the method of refining gold and silver by means of lead, and many other preparations and experiments. To Roger Bacon we owe the rectification of the error committed in the Julian calendar with regard to the solar year; the physical analysis of the action of lenses, and that of convex glasses, the invention of achromatic lenses, and, perhaps, the first construction of the telescope. In chemical science, the same great genius investigated the properties of saltpetre, and if he did not invent gunpowder, which is precisely described in the writings of Marcus Græcus, fifty years before his time, he at least contributed to perfect its preparation, by pointing out the method of purifying saltpetre by means of its dissolution in water, and subsequent crystallization. He also directed attention to the chemical influence of the air upon combustion. Raymond Lully, whose "*Ars Magna*" forms a kind of encyclopædia of the whole system of philosophy known in his time, also contributed materially to improve the dawning science of chemistry. To him we owe the preparation of carbonate of potash by means of tartar and of wood-ashes, the rectification of spirits of wine, and the preparation of essential

oils. Basil Valentine, in his "*Currus triumphalis Antimonii*," has so thoroughly investigated the properties of antimony—a metal scarcely heard of before his time—that facts with regard to it have been there found described, which were for some time regarded as modern discoveries. In the same work, he mentions several highly important chemicals, such as muriatic acid, which he prepared, just as we now do, by means of common salt and sulphuric acid. He also describes the means of obtaining brandy by the distillation of wine and beer, and the mode of rectifying the product by re-distillation over carbonate of potash. He points out the method of separating copper from its pyrites, by changing it first into sulphate of copper, and then plunging an iron plate into the aqueous solution of that product. The "Treatise upon Salts," of the same great man, contains most of the interesting chemical facts with regard to the nature and action of saline compounds. He understood the preparation of fulminating gold, and of sulphuric ether; and, in short, there were scarcely any among the chemical agents known in his time, upon which he has not left useful and practical observations.

The existence of oxygen, which was only demonstrated by Priestley towards the end of the last century, was divined by Eck de Sulzbach, a German Alchymist of the thirteenth century; and even before the revival of letters, the Alchymists knew how to volatilize mercury, to purify and concentrate alcohol, to prepare sulphuric and nitro-muriatic acids, and the different kinds of ethers. They were also acquainted with the means of purifying the fixed and carbonated alkalies, and had discovered the means of dyeing scarlet, even better than we can now do.

Paracelsus, one of the most celebrated among the adepts, has obtained a high and justly merited medical reputation by being the first to bring into use as medicines the chemical compounds of the various metals; he substituted simple medicines for the old pharmacopœia of the Galenists, overcharged with complicated and often inert preparations, and he was the first who had the sagacity and boldness to perceive and inculcate the propriety of the application of chemistry to human physiology and pathology. Van Helmont, a believer in the philosopher's stone, though not a practical Alchymist, was the author of the greatest chemical discovery of his age, that of the existence of the gases, and the works of Rudolph Glauber, who was also a believer in metallic transmutations, are full of valuable chemical knowledge, and are especially remarkable for the fulness and accuracy of their practical details.

It would be easy to extend this list of chemical discoveries due to the Alchymists, to almost any length, by referring to names somewhat less celebrated in the Hermetic annals than

those already cited. We might mention, for example, J. B. Porta, who discovered the manner of reducing the metallic oxides, the preparation of the oxide of tin, and the mode of colouring silver; Brandt, who discovered phosphorus whilst seeking the philosopher's stone in a product of the human body; Alexander Lethon, and Michel Sendivogius, his pupil, who, while cultivating Alchemy, discovered the methods of perfecting the dyeing of stuffs, and the preparation of vegetable and mineral colours; and, last of all, Bötticher, who, while shut up in a fortress by the Elector of Saxony in order to extort from him the secret of transmutation, succeeded in discovering the method of preparing porcelain, since carried to such perfection at Dresden. But we have surely said enough to prove the important benefits for which modern science is indebted to the patient labours of the too rashly despised Hermetic philosophers.

"It is, then," says M. Figuier, "with the numerous discoveries effected by the Alchemists that modern chemistry has been able to establish itself. Undoubtedly, all these facts are not connected by any common bond of union; they do not constitute a systematic whole, and they cannot, consequently, present the characteristics of a science; but they furnish the elements indispensable to the creation of a scientific system. It is owing to the powerful influence which the grand idea of metallic transmutation exercised upon the minds of the Alchemists during fifteen centuries, that they have been able to accomplish the preparatory labours necessary for establishing, upon a solid foundation, the monument of chemistry. Before arriving at the conviction that the philosopher's stone was a chimera, it was necessary to pass under review all the facts accessible to observation, and when, after 1500 years of labour, the day came when the conviction of that error dawned upon their minds, with that day also commenced the science of chemistry. Chemists of our times pass not too severe a judgment upon the Hermetic philosophers—do not insist on depriving us of all respect for their ancient heritage! Mad or sublime, they are our true ancestors. If Alchemy has not found that which she sought, she has found that which she did not seek. She has failed in her long struggles for the discovery of the philosopher's stone, but she has found chemistry, and that conquest is more precious than the vain secret pursued with such eagerness by our fathers. Chemistry has transformed into inexhaustible sources of riches gifts of God formerly valueless; she has lightened the painful weight of evils which press upon human nature,—improved the material conditions of our existence, and enlarged the limits of our moral activity; and, although she does not reveal the philosopher's stone of the ancient adepts, she may be said to contain the philosopher's stone of nations."

On casting a general retrospect over the doctrines of the

Hermetic philosophers, it is difficult to deny that they had the effect of arresting, for a long time, the progress of the human mind in the knowledge of natural truths; and, on this ground, it is impossible to withhold from them our strong condemnation. But, at the same time, it is worth while inquiring whether many of these doctrines were not the inevitable results of the false philosophy then universally prevalent. The most flourishing period of Alchemy corresponds to the second half of the historical period of the Middle Ages, when the philosophy of Aristotle and the New Platonism were exclusively dominant in the schools; and the dynamical properties attributed to the philosopher's stone, as well as the strange and fantastic means often employed for its discovery, seem but the natural consequences of the philosophy of the period; just as the speculations of the Alchemical mystics resulted from an exaggeration of the religious passions of the same epoch.

We have already stated that the long-continued prevalence Alchemical beliefs was owing to a false, but universally received, theory of metallic composition; and the final blow which led to their general overthrow and abandonment was dealt by Lavoisier: according to his theory, which soon met with almost universal acceptance, the metals, instead of being composite, were simple bodies, that is, indecomposable into their elements; this view was clearly incompatible with the Alchemical idea, that the nature of the metals was uniform, and might be varied at pleasure; and, from the date of its reception, we may date the expulsion of Alchemy from the domains of science. But, long after this period, many individuals still continued to adhere to the doctrines and practice of the Hermetic art. Thus, in the seventeenth century, arose the fraternity of the Rosicrucians, a sect of enthusiastic Paracelsists, who believed in the transmutation of metals, the art of prolonging life during several centuries, the power of knowing what passed in distant places, and the application of the cabala and the science of numbers to the discovery of the most hidden secrets. Still later, towards the close of the last century, the Hermetic Society of Westphalia was founded in Germany, and continued in existence until 1819. In 1832, there appeared a *brochure* entitled "Hermes Unveiled," in which the author claimed to have succeeded, after thirty-seven years of labour, in performing a transmutation into gold; and M. C. Théodore Tiffereau, teacher of chemistry in the preparatory school of Nantes, has addressed six successive memoirs to the French Academy, the last in December, 1854, in which he defends the doctrines of the Hermetic philosophers, and asserts that he himself has successfully performed the operation of transmutation.

The second and third parts of M. Figuier's work are not of equal interest with the first, and we can only briefly allude to them. In the former is a long list of sovereigns favourable to Alchymy. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, many monarchs were ranked among the number of adepts. The Emperor Rudolph II., surnamed the Hermes of Germany, was the most distinguished of these Alchymical monarchs. He ascended the throne in 1576; and at his court all adepts were sure of a kind reception and hospitable entertainment. He was generally believed to have been among the fortunate possessors of the philosopher's stone; and the immense wealth discovered in his laboratory after his decease gave countenance to this idea. It is said to have amounted to eighty-four hundredweight of gold, and sixty of silver, melted into the form of bricks. Augustus, Elector of Saxony, was another royal patron of Alchymy, and his successor Christian, also partook of his fondness for the Hermetic art. The former is said to have left at his death seventeen millions of rix-dollars, which were commonly reported to have been obtained by transmutation. Frederick III., Emperor of Germany, with his own hands operated a transmutation of mercury into gold with some of the philosopher's stone, which had been sent him by the adept Richthausen. Frederick I. and II. of Prussia also patronized the professors of Alchymy, although, towards the end of his reign, the latter severely satirized their extravagant pretensions. In Spain, Alphonso, surnamed the Wise, applied himself to Hermetical researches; and Edward III. of England, according to Alchymical authorities, received from Raymond Lully, then his prisoner in the Tower, the gold which was coined into the money known as "rose nobles." Charles XII. of Sweden and Gustavus Adolphus are also said to have profited by the labours of the adepts. The latter was reported to have received from a pretended merchant one hundred pounds weight of gold which was struck into ducats bearing the marks of their Hermetic origin; and 1,700,000 crowns are said to have been found in the repositories of the mysterious donor. An Alchymist was a very common appendage to the courts of the sovereigns of this period; and many of the German monarchs seized upon the persons of those adepts who were said to be in possession of the great secret, and confined and tortured them, with the view of compelling them to exert their art for the benefit of the royal treasury. With regard to those adepts who were convicted of fraud and imposture, their punishment was summary and peculiar: they were clothed in a robe of gold tinsel and hanged upon a gilded gibbet.

The third part of M. Figuier's work contains an elaborate

account of the principal instances of metallic transmutations which have been handed down to us. It will amply repay an attentive perusal; but we prefer passing on to the concluding part, entitled "Alchymy in the Nineteenth Century," which is exceedingly interesting and well written. M. Figuier there points out that Alchymical belief and practice still exist, in spite of the accumulation of adverse facts and arguments which modern chemistry has brought together; that dreaming and meditative Germany is still distinguished for the number of her Hermetical students; that in Bavaria and Hanover whole families might be mentioned who still occupy themselves with Alchymical pursuits; and that, in various towns of France, and especially in Paris, the philosopher's stone is still made an object of anxious and persevering research. M. Figuier gives anything but a flattering picture of the Alchymists of modern Paris:—

"I frequented" (he says) "in 184— the laboratory of M. L—; it was the rendezvous of the Parisian Alchymists. When the pupils had left the lecture-rooms after the labours of the day, one saw, with the first shades of evening, the modern adepts entering one by one. Nothing could be more singular than the appearance, manners, and costume of these strange men. I met them occasionally during the day in the public libraries, bent over huge folios; in the evening, in remote places, near the solitary bridges, with their eyes fixed in dreamy contemplation on the bright and starry vault of heaven. Old, or faded before their time, a shabby black coat, or a long riding cloak of an indefinable shade, covered their emaciated limbs. An unshorn beard half concealed their features, furrowed by deep wrinkles, where might be read the tale of long labours, night vigils, and devouring anxieties. In their slow, measured, and solemn speech, there was something of the tone which we attach to the *illuminati* of the last centuries. Their countenances, at once proud and desponding, bore traces of the agonies of ardent hopes, a thousand times lost, and a thousand times caught up again in despair."

There was one exception, however, to the general repulsiveness of these adepts of the nineteenth century; a man, still young and of striking external appearance, who, instead of combating like his companions the doctrines of modern chemistry, was constantly citing them as affording the strongest support and confirmation of his Hermetical beliefs; and the greater portion of the last part of the volume is occupied by a dialogue, in which this young Alchymist and our author are the speakers. The former gives a clear and eloquent summary of all the arguments in favour of Alchymy arising from analogy and history, and M. Figuier successively answers and disproves the whole of them.

"For our part" says the former, "enlightened by the discoveries of modern philosophy, we condemn the mystical aberrations of the ancient adepts. We disown the idea of a universal panacea and of an *animus mundi*. At present the whole Alchymical doctrine is confined to the belief that there exists a substance, having within itself the secret power of transmuting all chemical substances, and, in particular, of operating metallic transmutations. The object of Alchemy is the discovery of this agent, which many adepts have formerly possessed, but which is now lost to us. That is the question in all its simplicity."

He then goes on to show that modern discoveries prove that the transmutation of metals is a phenomenon perfectly realizable; and he particularly refers to a recently discovered property in bodies called *Isométrie*, which is thus explained:—

"The perfection of chemical analysis has made us understand that mineral or organic productions may present a complete identity in their composition, although their external properties are of the most opposite nature. Thus, fulminic acid, which enters into the composition of fulminating powders, contains exactly the same quantities of carbon, oxygen, and azote, as cyanic acid; yet the fulminates detonate with violence on the slightest elevation of temperature, while the cyanates require a red heat. Hydrocyanic acid, the most terrible of poisons, differs in its composition in nothing from formiate of ammonia, one of the most inoffensive salts; and chemistry furnishes a crowd of similar examples."

The modern Alchymist then goes on to argue that this isomeric property of compound bodies most probably belongs also to the elementary ones, such as the metals; and, that though this cannot be proved directly, as they resist our present means of analysis, yet that the analogical proof in its favour is almost irresistible; and he brings forward in support of this reasoning a recent discovery of M. Dumas, the chief of French chemistry, who has observed a remarkable similarity between the general properties of isomeric bodies and those of the metals. He then goes on to contend that, if this be so, it proves that—

"The metals, though differing in their external properties, present one and the same substance differently arranged or condensed. But, if it is true that the metals are isomeric, the first deduction to be drawn from this fact is, that it is possible to change the one into the other, that is to say, to realize metallic transmutations."

To this M. Figuier answers at length, concluding his reply in the following terms:—

"The arguments which you invoke in favour of metallic transmutation, rest upon no solid foundation. But I go further; I admit for a moment with you that these considerations possess a certain

weight; I admit, in particular, that the remarkable comparisons made by M. Dumas between the equivalents* of simple substances of the same family, and that other extraordinary affinity found by Dr. Prout between the equivalent of hydrogen and the equivalents of all the other elementary bodies, may authorize the conclusion, which you do not fear to deduce, of the *isométrie* of the metals; I say that, granting all this, the question will still be very far from being decided in your favour. Accepting, indeed, all these data as available, we would be led to the following conclusion:—In the present state of our knowledge, we cannot prove, in an absolutely rigorous manner, that the transmutation of metals is impossible: certain circumstances are opposed to the rejection of the Alchymical opinion as an absurdity at variance with facts. This, in its utmost extent, is the only concession to which you are reasonably entitled. But it by no means follows that a fact has existence, because we are not prepared to demonstrate its impossibility. We may not know how to prove that lead will never be changed into gold, but it does not result from that, that the transmutation of these metals can be effected. I insist upon that last reflection, because it alone appears to me to cut the thread of your whole argument."

To this the modern Alchymist replies—You admit all that I require; for, if you once acknowledge the possibility of transmutation, it only remains for me to show that it has actually been accomplished, which history enables me to do triumphantly; and he then proceeds to recapitulate the most striking instances of transmutation which have descended to us. These, however, are boldly met and explained away by our author, who points out that the facts alleged are destitute of that degree of proof which a sound philosophical criticism is entitled to demand; that although human testimony is receivable without reserve in the case of ordinary facts which only require for their establishment an unprejudiced mind and faithful senses, it is otherwise with the proof required for the truth of a physical fact or scientific result. These require other and stronger testimony, and such, in the case of Alchymy, is entirely wanting. And even admitting all the facts alleged, it remains to be explained how it happens, that a discovery, such as that of the philosopher's stone, once made, could ever have been lost. But, besides, there is a more effectual reply to be found than even this, in some of the treatises in which the opponents of Alchymy have exposed the collusions and frauds practised by the adepts; and particularly in the dissertation of the academician Geoffroy, "upon the frauds connected with the philo-

* By "equivalent" in chemistry is meant the weight, or quantity by weight, of any body which is required to unite with another body in order to form a definite compound.

sopher's stone," presented, in 1722, to the Academy of Sciences at Paris. There will be found the key to all these pretended mysteries; the exposure of that incredible series of frauds, impostures, tricks, and sleight of hand of all kinds, by which the Alchymists, for ten centuries, succeeded in imposing upon human credulity.

Our limits now warn us that it is time to bring this article to a close. We have lingered over M. Figuier's work, attracted by the interest and variety of the subject, and by the able and comprehensive manner in which it is treated. We have seen that a single false theory, with regard to the composition of metals, could retard for 1000 years the progress of humanity, and cast the spell of falsehood over the keenest intellects of the Middle Ages, numbering among its votaries philosophers, nobles, and kings. We have seen that false theory at length exposed, mediæval darkness disappearing, the steady light of modern science springing up phoenix-like from the smouldering ashes of Alchymy, and the human intellect, aroused and enlightened, advancing onwards with giant steps in the path of discovery. It may be urged that our subject has been the history of error, and this, to a certain extent, is correct. But truth is one; error is various, and the investigation of its history has always a tendency to place us a step nearer to the path of truth. And although, from the lofty eminence of positive science, we may now look back with pity upon the aberrations and follies of the Alchymists, we ought never to forget our obligations to them, while we should respect and imitate the earnest piety, glowing energy, and unwearied perseverance, that sometimes dignified and redeemed the vanity of their pursuit.

ART. VI.—THE HULSEAN LECTURES FOR 1856.

1. *The Glory of the Only Begotten of the Father, seen in the Manhood of Jesus Christ*: being the Hulsean Lectures for 1856. By the Rev. Harvey Goodwin, M.A., Cambridge. Deighton: Bell & Co.
2. *The Christian Cosmos: The Son of God the Revealed Creator*. By Edward William Grinfield, M.A. London: Seeley & Co.

THE religious thought and life of the great Evangelical party, both in the Church of England and among the various Nonconformist denominations, still exhibit numerous and remarkable traces of their origin and early history. Whitfield and Wesley roused a slumbering and godless nation into religious

earnestness by preaching a few elementary truths about the danger of the sinner, the necessity of forgiveness and the new birth, and the fulness of the Christian salvation; and these truths still constitute the substance of evangelical preaching. Whether, however, those aspects of Christian doctrine which alone could compel religious indifference to become anxious, and transform gross wickedness into some faint resemblance to the bright image of God, are the only elements of truth required to discipline and perfect a cultured Christian life, thoughtful and devout people are beginning to consider. And whether the highest type of spiritual life is that which is naturally originated in the midst of the excitement and restlessness of a national religious revival, is another question of equal and, perhaps, greater importance; for it is obvious to every man who has any acquaintance with the interior condition of evangelical communities, that every development of the religious nature which does not conform to the revival model is suspected and undervalued.

But the two books we have placed at the head of this article remind us rather of the early history than of the origin of Evangelicalism in England. Very soon after its rise, and while its theological system was assuming a definite form, and being permanently consolidated, its divines had to engage in a hot polemical warfare on behalf of the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ; and it is one of the natural and almost necessary results of the Unitarian controversy, which troubled the close of the last century and the beginning of this, that Evangelical Christians are less influenced than they should be, by a vigorous and practical faith in the manhood of the Lord Jesus Christ. While our fathers were exhausting their strength and their learning to demonstrate his divinity, we cannot wonder that they were more earnestly concerned about the truth their adversaries denied, than about that which was in no peril. One of the surest methods to bring an acknowledged truth into emphatic prominence is to deny it. The wealth we have earned by hard work is most dearly prized, and what has cost us nothing is commonly very lightly valued; it is an illustration of precisely the same principle that the truths we have to fight for, have the firmest hold on our hearts, while those which nobody denies are too often neglected and forgotten. Some Gibraltar rock, won at first and retained afterwards by desperate valour, is more cared for, even apart from the importance of its position, than thousands of square miles of richest corn-land, which were gained without fighting, and have never been desolated by invading armies, or endangered by the intrigues of diplomacy. What is universally admitted is seldom thought of; and what

is seldom thought of is gradually forgotten. Truth is like a torch, "the more it's shook it shines."

That it is absolutely necessary, however, to realize the manhood of the Lord Jesus, with its infirmities, sorrows, and dependence, in order to attain a true and vivid conception of his earthly history, needs no proof or illustration. And we are more and more deeply convinced that in an age of speculation and scepticism, there is nothing either in the external evidences, or the contents of our Christian faith, in the presence of which doubts so swiftly vanish as that wondrous history in which all that is human and all that is divine, are so mysteriously intermingled. Long after the gloomy but resistless flood of scepticism has rushed over the continent of our early beliefs, the conviction that God was in Christ rises in solitary strength above the dark and restless waters; and if ever even *that* is submerged, it is the first to reappear above the receding tide.

The New Testament itself should teach us the supreme importance of a full and perfect faith in the Personal Christ. Of the seven-and-twenty separate documents which constitute the Christian Scriptures, the first four are biographies of the Lord Jesus; the fifth is a history of the formation of a community of which he himself, and not any creed about him, was the recognized foundation, and of the labours of heroic men, who under the inspiration of a burning zeal for his honour, and at the impulse of an unfaltering obedience to his commands, traversed a large portion of Europe and Asia, telling men what he had suffered on earth and the glory he was crowned with in heaven; and a careful study of the Epistles will result in the conviction that the object of the apostles was not so much to teach or demonstrate a system of truth, as to explain the works and the laws of One whom most of them had personally known in his earthly humiliation, and whom the greatest of them had seen in his celestial glory. They were not philosophers but historians; they preached not a creed but a Person. In the pages of the New Testament it is Christ that stands in the centre of all teaching, and precept, and labour, and worship. Not even the majestic form of truth is permitted to share the throne with him.

But we repeat, that in order to know Christ fully, we must know him in his manhood as well as in his divinity. Although few details of his infancy are recorded in the Gospels, we are told enough to know that he came into the world, not in the fulness of physical, intellectual, and moral strength, in a sudden and startling way, but like the rest of mankind in a condition of helplessness and dependence. As a child, we can imagine him wandering over the hill on which Nazareth was built, plucking

handfuls of wild flowers, and bringing them to his mother before he clearly understood the awful dignity of the nature which was hidden within him. That we might not suppose he was exempted from the ordinary conditions and laws of humanity, we are distinctly told that he was subject to his parents, and "grew in wisdom and in stature." In his after years, short as the evangelical histories are, we have proof in abundance that his body, soul, and spirit, were really, and not in appearance only, human. He hungered in the wilderness, thirsted on the cross, slept in the ship; when he was dead, blood and water, as John significantly tells us, flowed from his side; and even after his resurrection, he could say, "a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." His knowledge not only grew in childhood, but was limited in mature life; for he spoke of an "hour" the time of the coming of which even he could not foresee. Such a heart as good men have throbbing in their breast, the Master had too; he was grieved because of men's unbelief, and once at least looked round upon his tempters with anger; he had select friends whom he loved with peculiar affection; he wept with mourning women, even when he was about to raise their dead brother to life again; he shrank from suffering and death, and, "with strong cryings and tears," prayed to God who was able to deliver him. His spiritual nature was as truly human as his intellect and heart; being susceptible of temptation, sanctified by the power of God, disciplined by suffering, and dependent on prayer. All the attributes of perfect manhood were his, and he had a human history, human duties, human relationships, and spoke of himself and was spoken of by others under titles which can belong only to a man.

But he must have read the Gospels with a dull eye and a sluggish mind, who has not remarked that, while every circumstance has been given which we need, to verify the Humanity of Jesus, nothing is recorded which strips him for a moment of an unearthly dignity, or tempts our loving trust to become irreverently familiar. We are told that Jesus was an obedient child, a gentle and sympathizing friend, sensitive alike to injury and to affection, that he went to a marriage feast, walked in the corn-fields, sat at supper, rested in his weariness, slept in his exhaustion; and yet, not for a moment is the divine glory altogether eclipsed by the human feebleness. Even more than this can be said. Mr. Harvey Goodwin has shown with equal power and beauty, with singular eloquence and felicity of illustration, that in those very aspects of Christ's nature and history, which constitute the most impressive evidences of his humanity, there may be discovered a glory which can shine forth from none save the Only Begotten of the Father.

The prayers, the sympathies, the friendships, the very death of Christ, are shown to present to thoughtful and spiritual consideration traces of the divinity within. Through the veil of the Holy of Holies, through its thickest, darkest folds, some rays of the inner glory are intense enough to penetrate.

But undoubting as is our faith in this fundamental truth of the Christian religion—that in Jesus Christ God became personally one with a creature, how hard it is habitually to realize it! We speak of the vast descent from the ancient majesty of the Eternal Word to “the form of a servant,” and “the death of the cross;” but the greatness and the humiliation are, each of them, beyond the range of our conception; and the attempt to bring them together in one Being quite confounds and overwhelms us. Perhaps no better method can be chosen by which to aid our feebleness than that suggested by the second of the books at the head of this article. Mr. Grinfield has exhibited in his “Christian Cosmos,” the scriptural proof and the various applications of the great orthodox doctrine that Christ was the Creator of the world; and we *can* bring together the magnificent history of creation, the imperial splendours of the first chapter of Genesis, and the narrative of the crucifixion, with its gloom, its humiliation, and its horror. These are two chapters in the history of one person,—though in the first, we hear God saying, “Let there be light,” and there is light, and see the green earth and the tumultuous sea, the beauty and grandeur and wealth of this fair world, and the glories of heaven come into being at the impulse of his will, and in obedience to his word; and in the other, all that common observers perceive is a wretched man suffering shame, anguish, and death. But the outline of the luminary may be seen by a keen eye, even in the depth of the eclipse; the Christian recognises in the crucified One, God made flesh.

Surely there it a new significance in the history of creation when we remember that it was he who in the beginning made the heavens and the earth, who afterwards came to reconcile earth to heaven. We do not forget that though God became man in Christ Jesus, it was not God, but man, that died on the cross; but we err from the guidance of the apostles if we fix a great gulf between the divine and the human elements of his complex nature. Christ suffered; and though on the Creator suffering cannot rest, Christ was, nevertheless, the Creator. And as, during the process of creation, the world presented day after day new features of loveliness and increasing fitness for its future inhabitants, he knew all that was to happen to it; knew that it would be filled with confusion, wickedness, and misery; that crimes so great and so numerous would be committed by the race

which was to people it, that only through an atonement effected by himself could any individual among the millions of mankind escape from appalling ruin ; he knew that after the earth had been burdened with the wickedness of forty centuries, he himself, in the person of Jesus Christ, would be "numbered with the transgressors," and that the very world he was making would be first the prison in which he would languish, and then the scaffold on which he would expire. He had clearly before him, as day after day of creation passed by, the day of crucifixion and death. When the dry land rose out of the waters, he looked upon a narrow strip of land on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, and anticipated the miracles, and the teaching, and the suffering which were to make that land illustrious through eternity ; he knew who would hunger in the wilderness which he saw there ; and who, through nights of prayer, would experience the keenness of the winds which visited its open mountain sides ; he saw the place under which the exhausted sufferer was to sink under the burden of the cross ; and recognised the very spot on which that cross would be erected. But he went on creating ; and in all this was not the victim of an iron necessity or a blind fate ; what he did was done freely ; his heart went with his hand. He rejoiced in all his work, and felt that it was good.

The man who has once known what it is to see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, will be conscious of oppressive and intolerable darkness if ever, through the corruption of his heart or through invading doubts which his intellect cannot repel, that bright presence is obscured or lost. The vigour of faith, the depth of joy, the beauty of holiness, the rapture of hope which, blending into one, constitute the perfection and blessedness of the Christian life, are the result and evidence of spiritual union with the Christ of God, and can only be found in him.

We trust that our readers will prove for themselves the worth of Mr. Goodwin's lectures and Mr. Grinfield's little treatise. We should be ungrateful if we did not acknowledge that to both of them we owe—not, indeed, a stronger faith in the truths on which we have been writing, but a profounder conviction of their practical importance and spiritual power.

Quarterly Review of American Literature.

AMERICA has recently completed the eightieth year of her Independence, and during the last half-century has made rapid advancement in science and literature. The foundations of her mental culture were laid by the Pilgrim Fathers of New England, who deemed human learning second only to divine. Within ten years after their voluntary exile, in the midst of many privations and sufferings, they founded a college, and dedicated it to God and the church. Thus they prepared young men to be preachers, legislators, judges, and defenders of civil liberty. These enlightened men also provided, by legal enactment, for free schools. The result of their measures was soon manifested in the department of theological literature.

Early in the eighteenth century appeared Jonathan Edwards, of Connecticut, styled, both by Robert Hall and Dr. Chalmers, the greatest of theologians, and whom Dugald Stuart and Sir James Mackintosh eulogized as unsurpassed among metaphysicians. President Edwards imparted a new distinctness and prominence to theological doctrines which had been vaguely believed by good men in all ages of the Christian church, but had been obscured by scholastic subtleties. His opinions had an important influence, not only in his native country, but in Great Britain, where they were embraced by Dr. Erskine, Andrew Fuller, and other eminent divines.

Among President Edwards's contemporaries, or immediate successors, were Dr. Samuel Johnson, the father of the American Episcopal Church; the learned Dr. Jonathan Mayhew; President Styles, famous for his acquirements in almost every department of learning; the eloquent Doctors Dwight, Maxey, and Mason, men of great abilities and profound scholarship, who, from the important stations they occupied, as well as by their writings, gave a powerful impulse to the literature of their country.

There have been many obstacles to retard the successful cultivation of letters in America, one of which is the want of a *just law of international copyright*, equally a cause of complaint by authors there and in England. Nevertheless, much has been accomplished, and she now annually pours forth from the press many valuable works in every department of knowledge.

There were published in that country, during 1854, 765 new books and new editions, of which only 277 were reprints of English books, and 41 translations. During 1855, 1,092 new books and new editions, including 250 reprints of English books, and 38 translations. And during the six months to July, 1856, 751 new books and new editions, of which but 102 were reprints of English books, and 26 translations.

In this Review of American literature, our limits will not permit us to give a thorough analysis of the books noticed, but only a condensed view of some of those which we think will be the most

interesting to our readers. Among the theological works, Dr. Murdock's "*Literal Translation of the New Testament, from the Syriac-Peshito Version*,"¹ will be useful to Biblical students, who are anxious to acquire a critical knowledge of the sacred volume. This is the most valuable English translation of the New Testament ever made from the Peshito. The books of the New Testament are divided into paragraphs, according to the sense; the common divisions into chapters and verses are noted in the margin, and the verses are also placed in parentheses in the middle of the lines. Deviations of the Syriac from the Greek text are likewise indicated in the side margin. Dr. Murdock appears to have adhered, in this translation, to the following principles: to translate, as literally as possible in consistence with idiomatic and perspicuous English—to use Saxon phraseology in preference to Latin—to adopt the solemn style of the English Bible—to avoid the use of technical theological terms, &c. The Peshito is pre-eminent among the versions of the New Testament, for its high antiquity, the competence and fidelity of the translators, and the affinity of its language to that spoken by our Lord and his apostles. It is generally admitted, by the most distinguished Oriental scholars, to be the oldest translation of the New Testament that has come down to us in any language. The character of the version—its simple, lucid, and direct style—affords evidence that it was produced in the very earliest ages of the Christian church. The translation has been skilfully executed, and may be relied on for its fidelity to the original; but, in several instances, we should have preferred a closer adherence to the venerable phraseology of our own English version. It will be useful, not only to ministers and theological students, but to all who desire to read the Word of God with understanding. The learned translator was formerly Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, and is favourably known by his excellent translation of Mosheim's "*Ecclesiastical History*."

In connexion with the preceding notice, Uhlemann's "*Syriac Grammar*,"² deserves mention, as containing a complete apparatus for the study of the Syriac, and a method which supersedes the necessity of an instructor. The materials are skilfully arranged, and the Chrestomathy is composed of extracts from the Peshito, followed by a minute verbal analysis.

Professor Hackett's "*Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles*"³ is more especially adapted to the instruction and assistance of theological students; but the general reader, not

¹ The New Testament; or, the Book of the Holy Gospel of our Lord and our God, Jesus the Messiah. A literal translation from the Syriac-Peshito Version. By James Murdock, D.D. New York: royal 8vo.

² Uhlemann's Syriac Grammar. Translated from the German, by Enoch Hutchinson. With a Course of Exercises in Syriac Grammar, and a Chrestomathy and Brief Lexicon, prepared by the translator. New York: 8vo.

³ A Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles. By H. B. Hackett, Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institution. Boston: royal 8vo.

versed in the principles of sacred criticism, will derive much benefit from a study of the volume. Professor Hackett has displayed sound judgment and discrimination in the arrangement; and it is the most valuable critical and exegetical work on the original text of this portion of the New Testament, yet published in English. He has presented us with the latest investigations, and his own notes are of sterling value. We understand that a new and revised edition will soon be issued in Boston.

We are pleased to see that Professor Hackett's "Illustrations of Scripture; suggested by a Tour through the Holy Land," have been republished in this country. In this interesting volume, we observe the same careful observation and judicious criticism which characterise his other publications.

Professor Chace's "*Discourse on the Relation of Divine Providence to Physical Laws*,"⁴ is a remarkable production, original and suggestive. It is obviously the result of conscientious study and profound thought. The author unites the severest analysis with the most comprehensive generalization. It would exceed our limits to present more than a mere outline of his arguments. The Professor says: "There are *three ways*, in which the power of the Divine Being, within the forms to which He has restricted its manifestation, may be exerted in directing the course of human events—remotely and indirectly through the organization and physical arrangements of the outward world; more nearly, through the constitution and endowments of each human being, whether immediately conferred, or transmitted by hereditary descent from the original progenitor of the human race; and yet more nearly by the direct influence exerted upon the hearts and consciences of men by his Holy Spirit." We believe that the intelligent reader, if he should not coincide in some of Professor Chace's views, will be impressed with the beauty of his style, the clearness of his statements, and his ingenious reasoning on a subject of great difficulty, but of the highest importance.

Dr. Sprague's "*Annals of the American Pulpit*,"⁵ is a large contribution to the biographical literature of his native country. The two volumes, now published, contain biographical notices of about three hundred and fifty orthodox congregational ministers, and, in continuation of the author's plan, will be followed with similar sketches of ministers of other denominations. These will be arranged in chronological order, and thus give a general view of the progress of the various branches of the Christian church. From the well-known fidelity and ability of the author, we are persuaded the entire work will be one of great interest and value.

⁴ A Discourse, delivered before the Porter Rhetorical Society of Andover Theological Seminary, August 1st, 1854. By George I. Chace, LL.D., Professor in Brown University. Boston: 8vo., pp. 66.

⁵ *Annals of the American Pulpit; or, Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of Various Denominations, from the Early Settlement of the Country to the Close of the Year 1855. With Historical Introductions.* By William B. Sprague, D.D. Vols. I. and II. New York: 8vo., pp. 721 and 778. (London: Low and Co.)

Dr. Baird has published a revised and enlarged edition of "*Religion in America*,"⁶ first printed in 1843, and translated into French, German, Dutch, Swedish, and Modern Greek. The author has now brought down his statements to the year 1855, with such modifications and enlargement as the progress of the country required. He gives the following statement of the five great evangelical denominations in the United States. The Congregationalists and Presbyterians being, in many important respects the same, he places *both* under the head of Presbyterians:—

	Churches.		Ministers.		Members.		Population.
Baptist	14,070	...	9,476	...	1,322,469	...	5,900,000
Methodist	14,000	...	8,740	...	1,593,794	...	5,500,000
Presbyterian...	10,566	...	8,472	...	926,318	...	5,500,000
Episcopalian ...	1,323	...	1,742	...	108,850	...	1,012,000
Lutheran	1,900	...	1,000	...	225,000	...	750,000

Dr. Baird's work is written in a catholic spirit, and well adapted to give just impressions of the history, polity, and progress of religion, and what is done for the interests of education, philanthropy, and home and foreign missions in the United States.

Among the numerous works of *general* literature we select the following:—

A new and improved edition of "*Franklin's Works*"⁷ has just appeared in the city which gave him birth. Everything that relates to the memory of Benjamin Franklin is interesting, and the deep veneration for his character that now prevails throughout the civilized world, would not permit his admirers to rest satisfied while any portion of his writings remained unpublished. Next to Washington, he has reflected most credit on his native country. It is fortunate that the preparation of these volumes has fallen into the hands of Mr. Sparks, who is so well qualified by his editorial experience, and who has bestowed unwearied labour on this undertaking. Almost all the writings of Franklin illustrate his practical and penetrating mind; and the work will form an enduring monument to the memory of this distinguished statesman and philanthropist.

The sixth edition of Wheaton's "*Elements of International Law*"⁸ has recently been published. This work originally appeared in 1836; and it was the first, of any importance, upon the principles of the law of nations, in the English language. It is divided into four parts, which treat respectively of the sources and objects of International Law—of the absolute International Rights of States

⁶ Religion in America; or, an Account of the Origin, Relation to the State, and Present Condition of the Evangelical Churches in the United States. With Notices of the Unevangelical Denominations. By Robert Baird, D.D. New York: 1856.

⁷ The Life and Works of Benjamin Franklin, containing several Political and Historical Tracts not included in any former edition; and many Letters, official and private, not hitherto published. With Notes, and a Life of the Author. By Jared Sparks. Boston: New Edition, 1856. Ten Vols., 8vo.

⁸ Elements of International Law. By Henry Wheaton, LL.D. With the last Corrections of the Author. Additional Notes, &c., by William Beach Lawrence. Boston: royal 8vo.

—of the International Rights of States in their pacific relations—and of the International Rights of States in their hostile relations. Connected at its most brilliant period with the highest tribunal of the United States, Mr. Wheaton had an opportunity to familiarize himself with the laws of nations; and being subsequently long employed in the diplomatic service of his country, he was well prepared to supply a deficiency on an important subject. The leading journals in Europe and in the United States have been emphatic in commendation of the ability, research, and candour which characterize the entire work. He was elected a foreign member of the Prussian Royal Academy of Sciences; and, in 1842, received the same compliment from the French Institute. The present improved edition is enriched with introductory remarks, containing a notice of Mr. Wheaton's diplomatic career, and of the antecedents of his life, by the Hon. W. B. Lawrence, formerly *chargé d'affaires* of the United States at London.

Irving's "*Life of George Washington*"⁹ is a biography worthy of the great American patriot. Mr. Irving has acquired a high and extensive celebrity, both at home and abroad; and this work will add to his well-deserved fame. The account of Washington's early life is copious, and narrated in a graphic manner. The founder of American Independence was born in 1732, in the county of Fairfax, in Virginia. The record of his services is the history of the whole war. The predominant features of his character were wisdom, consummate skill, and unsurpassed prudence. His integrity was incorruptible, and his principles free from the contamination of selfish and unworthy passions. Mr. Irving's admirers will recognise in this biography the same graceful style that marked his early productions.

Prescott's "*History of the Reign of Philip II.*"¹⁰ is a valuable contribution to the historical literature of the world, and deserves a permanent place both in private and public libraries. The expectations excited by his previous works, "*Ferdinand and Isabella*," "*Conquest of Mexico*," and "*Conquest of Peru*," are, if possible, more than realized in this, and place him in the first rank of historians. The author collected materials for this work from the principal archives and private libraries of Europe, to the amount of nearly ten thousand folio pages. The "*History of the Reign of Philip II.*" is the beginning of the decline of the Spanish monarchy, and the narration is not confined to Spain alone, but extends to the relations of that country with many nations. Mr. Prescott's account of the remarkable and diversified events of this period is given in a candid and philosophic spirit, and in a style flowing, clear, and energetic.

The popularity of Dr. Kane's "*Arctic Explorations*"¹¹ is evinced

⁹ *Life of George Washington*. By Washington Irving. In Three Vols. New York. Vols. I. and II., 8vo. Portraits, pp. 1024.

¹⁰ *History of the Reign of Philip II., King of Spain*. By William H. Prescott. Boston: Two Vols., 8vo.

¹¹ *Arctic Explorations: the Second Grinnell Expedition in Search of Sir John*

by the sale of more than thirty thousand copies in the United States; and the demand for the work is increasing. It is about to appear in Germany, under the auspices of Baron Humboldt; and in France is to be edited by M. De la Roquette.

The narrative and personal portion of these volumes will be perused with intense interest by those who read for mere entertainment, and the scholar will find a large supply of novel facts and scientific materials in the appendix. Dr. Kane was the principal historian in the Grinnell expedition, commanded by Lieut. J. De Haven; and, by his experience, was well qualified to take the command of this second expedition. The vessel was the "Advance," the same in which he had sailed before, and her entire force consisted of eighteen men—ten from the United States' navy, and eight volunteers. She sailed under private regulations, among which were absolute subordination to the officer in command, abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, and an entire disuse of profane language. The vessel's equipment was simple; and she sailed from New York on the 30th of May, 1853. On the 23rd of August they found their latitude to be $78^{\circ} 41'$, which was nearer the North Pole than the point which had been attained by any of their predecessors, excepting Parry on his Spitzbergen foot-tramp. After farther explorations, on the 10th of September they found themselves blocked up in a bay, which they named Renselaer Harbour, and here they spent two winters. When they ascertained, in the summer of 1854, that the ice under their vessel was nine feet thick, they took to their boats and sledges, made four extensive journeys in different directions, in the hope of finding the Franklin party; and, in the aggregate, travelled more than three thousand miles, fourteen hundred miles of which were accomplished by the commander, with a single team of Newfoundland dogs, with Esquimaux. As the brig was in a vast field of ice, and their fuel exhausted, to remain there a third winter would have been certain death. The only alternative was to abandon the "Advance," which they did, May 17th, 1855, and forced their way southward, by means of boats and sledges. With no shelter at night, and with their food reduced to the smallest allowance, for thirty-one days they continued their terrible and perilous march; they then embarked on the water, reached Cape Alexander, Melville Bay, and finally, Uppernavick—the largest of the group of Danish settlements—after an exposure of eighty-one days, and a fearfully severe journey of thirteen hundred miles. They arrived in New York, October 11th, 1855. Dr. Kane's volumes are full of instruction, and will be welcomed in every country of Europe.

"*The Life of Charles Sumner*"¹² contains the private and professional biography of the distinguished senator of Massachusetts; with an account of the violent and brutal assault committed upon

Franklin, 1853-54-55. By Elisha Kent Kane, M.D., U.S.N. Illustrated by 300 Engravings, from Sketches by the Author. Philadelphia: Two Vols., 8vo.

¹² *The Life of Charles Sumner: with Choice Specimens of his Eloquence, a Delineation of his Oratorical Character, and his great Speech on Kansas.* By D. A. Harsha, Author of "Eminent Orators, Statesmen, &c." New York.

him in the United States' Senate Chamber. This honoured martyr for freedom was born in Boston, January 6th, 1811. He graduated at Harvard University, in 1830, commenced the practice of law in 1834, and was soon afterwards appointed reporter to the Circuit Court; and published three volumes of reports. In 1851 he was elected to the United States' Senate, as the successor of Daniel Webster. Mr. Sumner is a ripe scholar, and is widely known for the extent of his legal knowledge and general attainments. He is an eloquent speaker, an ardent politician, and fearless in the defence of human rights and free territory.

The degree of excitement now existing in the Free States relating to slavery, is manifested by the number of publications issuing from the press on this subject. Among these, Barnes, the well-known commentator on the Scriptures, has published a new work, entitled "*The Church and Slavery*."¹³ The object of the eminent author is, first, to show "the general relation of the church to slavery"—then "the position of the Presbyterian Church before the division in 1838"—and next, and chiefly, the position of the "New School," or "Constitutional Presbyterian Church." He maintains that slaveholding is "abhorrent to the innate feelings of the mass of mankind;" that "it is a violation of the principles of the Declaration of Independence;" that it is at variance with the opinions of several general assemblies; and that it is *a sin, per se*. Mr. Barnes still advocates the opinions, contained in his former work, as to the duty of "discussing and agitating" it in the churches, the pulpits, and ecclesiastical assemblies; and that "the churches must *detach* themselves from all connexion with slavery" until it shall be entirely abolished. The subject is ably and faithfully discussed; and an extensive circulation of the work must have a salutary influence.

THE REV. DR. BURGESS AND KITTO'S "BIBLICAL CYCLOPÆDIA."

SHORTLY after the publication of our January Number, we received a note from Dr. Burgess, in which he expressed his surprise that we could "allow an *enemy* to act towards him as he has done in the *ECLECTIC*," adding that he intended to "expose the *REVIEW* fully ere long." We immediately replied, that had we suspected the writer of any feeling of personal hostility, we should have refused to admit the article, as it has been our constant endeavour to maintain strict impartiality, and to allow no feelings for or against an author to interfere with the claims of literary justice. We further stated that as we had not seen the new edition of the *Cyclopædia*, we could offer no opinion on the *Review*, excepting such as might be formed

¹³ *The Church and Slavery*. By Albert Barnes. Philadelphia: 12mo. 1857. (London: Low and Co.)

by any other reader. The statements, we remarked, were at least very explicit, and free from ambiguity; and, therefore, if not consistent with truth and justice, might be easily met and answered. Towards Dr. Burgess, our feelings were those of perfect goodwill, and we should sincerely regret if he had been treated with any degree of unfairness. In conclusion, we said that the next number of the *ECLECTIC* would be open for any vindication he might be disposed to send. After the lapse of a fortnight, Dr. Burgess informed us that we might expect a communication from him in the course of a few days; we received it, but not till the materials of the present number had been arranged; and, though with some inconvenience, we now redeem our promise by inserting it. In justice to the Reviewer, and from a wish not to protract the discussion beyond the present number, we transmitted to him a copy of Dr. Burgess's remarks, and have been favoured with his reply. We present both documents to our readers, without attempting to influence the decision that may be pronounced upon them feeling confident that the cause of truth and of just criticism will be eventually promoted by their publication.

JAN. 27th, 1857.

To the Editor of the Eclectic Review.

SIR,—I avail myself of your permission to reply to a Review, in your last number, of my edition of the "Biblical Cyclopædia." I have a very strong feeling that the article I am about to comment upon, ought not to have been admitted by you in the form it bears, exhibiting as it does so plainly, an *animus* unfavourable to myself, apart from any statement of facts, or conclusions legitimately drawn from them. But I will leave this topic, since the error, if it is one, has been made and cannot now be corrected: I am, therefore, obliged to you for the courtesy which allows me to explain what has been misconceived or misstated, and to defend myself from the personal attacks of the writer who has chosen your pages for his invidious criticisms.

The first paragraph of the article contains a statement utterly unsupported, namely, that I was chosen by the publishers of the Cyclopædia to revise it, solely because I had succeeded Dr. Kitto in the editorship of the *Journal of Sacred Literature*. I am not aware that my connexion with that work had anything to do with the engagement proposed to me by the Messrs. Black, but I do know that there were other grounds on which those gentlemen might justly think me competent to the task allotted to me. They knew me as the author of learned works which had procured for me the degree of Ph.D. from Göttingen (at the immediate instance of Ewald), and of LL.D. from Glasgow—works to which they had subscribed and copies of which were in their hands. They knew me, further, as the writer of a work on general literature, of which they had purchased the copyright, and of some contributions to the "Encyclopædia Britannica." But, principally, I had been brought under their notice in a public manner, as a candidate for the Rectorship of the Edinburgh Academy,—an office I had been urged to apply for by several eminent Scotchmen, and the competition for which procured me a body of testimonials, such as any scholar might be proud to own, bearing on my oriental, classical, and theological attainments. While I feel a great repugnance to the publication of such matters in your pages, I also feel that justice to myself and the Messrs. Black demands

that I should extract a few sentences from the document I refer to, in order to make it appear that your Reviewer was either unacquainted with my literary position, or purposely endeavoured to lower it. The testimonials were given in the year 1854:—

"What I have known of the literary attainments of Dr. Burgess," says Bishop Thirlwall, "leads me confidently to believe that he possesses very high qualifications for the mastership of a classical school."—"Your various writings," says Bishop Blomfield, "leave me in no doubt as to your ability, your knowledge of oriental languages, and your theological attainments." To these unexceptionable episcopal testimonies, Bishop Singer, an equally competent judge, adds, "I conceive that Dr. Burgess's attainments are such as to place him in the first rank of our literary men."—Dean Milman says, "Dr. Burgess's works display very considerable Biblical knowledge, and an accomplished mind."—The Rev. E. H. Gifford, Head Master of King Edward's School, Birmingham: "His published writings have convinced me that he is a scholar of varied and extensive attainments, of powerful intellect, and unwearied perseverance."—Dr. W. L. Alexander, of Edinburgh, a contributor to the "Biblical Cyclopædia": "I have derived much instruction from your writings, and I have a high sense of the accuracy and variety of your scholarship;"—and Dr. John Eadie, of Glasgow, another contributor: "From all that I know of the Rev. Dr. Burgess I have no hesitation in declaring that, in my opinion, he is qualified in no ordinary degree to fill the office of Rector of the Edinburgh Academy. His scholarship is of a high order, his industry is a marvel, and his character that of an accomplished Christian gentleman." Allow me to add to the above the following from laymen of known character and attainments:—Professor Fraser, of Edinburgh, says: "My intercourse with Dr. Burgess has afforded me varied evidence of the extent and solidity of his learning as well as of his general literary ability, and the unusual energy of his character in any service he undertakes."—Sir Gardner Wilkinson: "I willingly add my testimony to your general scholarship, which is so fully proved by your works."—The late Dr. Kitto: "The distinguished attainments of Dr. Burgess in general, as well as in sacred literature, have long been known to me." Above all, as an opinion likely to have weight with men in Scotland, Professor Pillans, of Edinburgh, selected me from other candidates to be Principal of the M'Gill College, Montreal, and in his letter to the directors of that institution, said: "At the close of a long interview Dr. Jackson and I both agreed that Dr. Burgess was the very man to succeed Dr. Hannah in the Edinburgh Academy; failing which, to be the Principal of M'Gill College. The weight of his testimonials was fully admitted by all the Directors of the Academy, but the want of an Oxford degree turned the scale in favour of another." I may add, that as an accident prevented my removal to Scotland, so an accident confined me to my native land, for it was discovered that the Principal of M'Gill College must be a *layman*—a fact omitted in the directions confided to Professor Pillans.

When, therefore, your Reviewer says that the publishers "were misled by my connexion with Kitto," and regrets that I "should have given such ample evidence of making pretensions to scholarship beyond the reality," he merely states his own opinion, unsupported by facts, and contrary to truth. I have nowhere made any pretensions; but have been honoured with abundant proofs that a life of study has not been in vain, both by the press, by competent individuals, and by learned universities. Neglect, carelessness, want of application to the *improbis labor* of a wearisome task, *might*, on a casual view of the subject, have been attributed to me with some show of reason; but pretensions to learning, defective scholarship, or a want of acquaintance with Biblical literature, are unsustained by the premises, and

are the mere figments of the writer's imagination, if not, as I much fear, the uncharitable products of his heart. That I may not have to recur to myself in this painful, though necessary manner, I will here dispose of another assumption of the Reviewer. He says that my not often citing foreign, and especially German authorities, arose from my "want of acquaintance with foreign literature"—a statement whose falseness is only equalled by its impertinence. I am not going to parade my knowledge in this department of learning before your readers, be it more or less; it will be sufficient to state that the resources of my own library, my acquaintance with foreign booksellers, and the fact that almost every new foreign work on Biblical and theological subjects passes through my hands, as editor of two highly influential journals, fully prove the utter baselessness of the inference. Had I not really been compelled to limit my additions within very narrow bounds, or abstained from quoting foreign works on principle, *because I thought they had already been adduced in undue proportion*, the task would have been easy to accumulate the titles of books published within the last ten years. I know it is the fashion with some men, like your Reviewer, to think that no treatise is valuable, unless staccatoed all over with German authorities; but I beg to state that I conscientiously pursue a different course. But, notwithstanding this, it will be found that a large proportion of German authors have been introduced by me into the revised Cyclopædia.

But it is time that I came to give an account of the *facts* adduced by your Reviewer to prove my duncehood. That the Cyclopædia is far from perfect, I am well aware; but there is something to be told which your Reviewer conceals, although aware of it, and which, when known, will relieve me at once of the burden of at least half the peccadilloes laid to my charge. That fact is, that the "Biblical Cyclopædia" was *stereotyped* at its first appearance, and that I revised the *plates* only—an entirely different affair from re-editing a work to be arranged and composed *de novo*. The late Dr. Kitto complained to me, before his illness, that he had a task to perform which could bring him no honour, for that it was impossible to revise the work as it ought to be done, unless the whole were set up afresh, and the original writers employed to improve their articles. When, therefore, I was applied to by the Messrs. Black, I knew well that I could secure no fame, or even credit, by what I undertook; and should have declined the proposal, had not the fact, that I, like Dr. Kitto, must live by literature, compelled me to accede to it. In a letter now before me, Messrs. Black explain their wishes; and a quotation from it will at once put your readers in possession of some *data* which entirely nullify many of the conclusions of your Reviewer, and exhibit the very restricted and peculiar circumstances in which I was called to act.

After alluding to Dr. Kitto's desire for *extensive* alterations—which they positively refused to listen to—Messrs. Black say:—

"It is our own opinion, which is fortified by the opinion of others better qualified to judge than ourselves, that the book is excellent, and requires very little in the way of correction or addition. We have a copy, interleaved and done up in parts, for Dr. Kitto's corrections; one of these was returned, but the corrections were generally very trifling—most of them merely verbal, and it was questionable whether the old matter or the new was the preferable—at least, it was seldom of such consequence, as to justify breaking the plates to make the corrections. Seeing, then, that the book is all stereotyped, we would only make corrections where they were *positively* necessary; and if words were struck out, employ just as much new matter as would fill up the space, or if small additions are necessary, strike out as much as would admit them; but where additions of any extent are necessary, there a full page or pages could easily be added, when we should

only have to alter the pagination. We have already made great alterations in the life of David, and some other articles, which really required correction. If you agree with us in what we consider necessary, and see that this can be done without much breaking up of the plates, we would allow you for editing a new edition," &c.

Having suggested that the original writers should be asked to revise their papers, and furnish corrections, the proposition was negatived as unnecessary, and as involving expense. I thus undertook the work, on the understanding that but little was needed, and that the remuneration, though small, was proportioned to the demands to be made upon me. On receiving the twelve parts of the work, interleaved for corrections, I found that *one* of them was that which Dr. Kitto had completed and returned to the publishers; and this gave me a pretty correct idea of what I ought to aim at in the other portions. On no other part but this had Dr. Kitto done anything; so that the insinuation of your Reviewer, that I had taken his rough notes, and used them as my own, is as false as it is uncharitable and slanderous. I proceeded to read the work carefully, going through the whole, except such articles as related to Natural History, to which I knew there was nothing I could add. Papers, too, like that on *Hook*, commented on so severely by the Reviewer, I often passed over, merely looking to the Hebrew and Greek characters, to detect any prominent error. *For I had a right to presume* that when so many writers and so competent an editor were employed on the original work, all of whom had the opportunity of having their errata corrected in the stereotype plates, long before I undertook the revision, *such papers were free from serious errors*; for if not correct when supplied and revised by the authors, could it be expected that a stranger would be likely to ensure more perfection? However, the reading of the work, in all the intervals I could give to it, occupied me *more than a year*, and I corrected or altered some thousands of places of more or less importance, as I have stated in the preface. The insinuation, that because I wrote—"some thousands of corrections *have been made*," I, therefore, did not make them at all, I meet by a direct assertion that *I made them all*, except in the first twelfth part of the work, and by "great and long-continued labour." I feel sure your readers will feel, that a writer who can thus employ the *suggestio falsi*, in order to injure me, is worthy of little confidence, whatever statements he may have made.

Now let me explain my exact position as to any *additions* which I might wish to make to articles in the Cyclopædia. When I came to a paper or a subject, the literature of which had been enlarged since the work was printed, I had to see to what extent my insertions of new matter were possible, and to act accordingly; for it was not enough to have the titles of half-a-dozen works ready to put in, but I must erase other matter to make room for them, and this was not always, or even often, practicable. It would have been unjust, in ordinary cases, to exclude an author already referred to in the work, merely to introduce the name of a more modern one. Many publications on the various topics were, therefore, excluded on this ground, and, in the case of those inserted, *something* had to be erased exactly equivalent in space; and *to that extent only*, the original writers were implicated in the work of another. But that was the business of Messrs. Black, not mine; and if those writers feel themselves aggrieved, I must refer them to those gentlemen. But, as I stated in the preface, I interfered as little as possible; and, while I *might* have done much, a feeling of honour prevented me from altering their productions further than my duty demanded.

By a careful compression, however, I managed to introduce a good deal of new matter, and to give fresh authorities to a far greater extent than is

supposed by the Reviewer. To take the first three letters of the alphabet only, I may mention, *inter alia*, the following works noted in their proper places. *Apocrypha*: three works of Tischendorf;—*Assyria*: the works mentioned in the Review, which were got in with great difficulty;—*Baruch*: the learned tract of Dr. H. Jolowicz;—*Bethphage*: Mr. Thrupp's "Ancient Jerusalem;"—*Bethsaida*: the "Bibliotheca Sacra;"—*Blood-revenge*: Layard's "Nineveh and Babylon;"—*Brother*: Mr. Swainson's paper on "The Brethren of our Lord;"—*Canticles*: the works of Delitzsch, Hahn, and Hengstenberg;—*Capernaum*: De Saulcy, and a writer in the "Journal of Sacred Literature;"—*Captivities*: the learned treatise of Mr. Kennedy;—*Colossians*: Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul;"—*Concordance*: the "Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance;"—*Corinthians, Epistles to*: Mr. Stanley's work;—*Creation*: Hitchcock, Dr. Prichard, and "Journal of Sacred Literature;"—*Biblical Criticism*: Davidson and Tregelles.

So much for additions. The corrections were of very various kinds, but I will mention two. Hebrew words were wrong in a vast number of places, and were set right. Then Josephus, quoted in almost every page, was mostly referred to only by book and chapter, obliging me to look out the *section*, which I did in hundreds of instances by a laborious consultation, more often than not of the Greek text. Those who are acquainted with my various publications, know that I am scrupulously accurate in all respects within my range of influence, and that being the case, I certainly am much vexed that so many errata still exist, and that in some few cases, new ones should have been made. But it must be remembered that I could only approximate to a guess as to what words would be sufficient to erase, in order to fit in the new matter; and much of the mere mechanism—a word more or less—had to be left to the parties in Edinburgh. The degree to which errors may creep into a stereotyped work from various accidents must be also taken into account. For example: your Reviewer says, on p. 87, in reference to the word *Hook*:—"Of the seven corrections made, four are wrong, and in making them, he has disfigured the book by employing a very different Greek type," &c. I do not believe I touched the article *Hook*, except to correct the Hebrew; and as I did not see the proofs of such little corrections, it is to be presumed the compositor might mistake the characters. But as to the different Greek type, how, in the name of Faust, can I be held responsible for that? A slight inspection of the page will show that the stereotype plate has here met with an accident, destroying part of a Greek word, which the printer has replaced with a newer character. Perhaps if there had been creases in the paper of your Reviewer's copy, or a fault in the binding, he would have held me responsible for them. For errors in the few proper names introduced I am not to be blamed, though I am responsible; for the articles were supplied by a gentleman in whom I thought I could place confidence, and I think he could defend himself were he to be consulted. For the statement that the life of David was rewritten, I was indebted to the publishers, who also are responsible for the information that the work was *thoroughly* revised.* "Westcott on the Canon" was not published when that part of the work was completed. In the addition to *Babylonia* several errors are indicated, but not one of them was made by me, but by the misapprehension of my writing by the printer. How could I confound *cuneiform* with *cruciform*, or mistake the spelling of the name of my friend Dr. Hincks?

* In the notice of the Cyclopædia in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, July, 1856, we find it stated, "The present edition has received many hundreds of corrections, and undergone a thorough revision."—Ed. E. R.

But I cannot continue this style of exculpation, although there is abundant material. I will conclude by alluding to the very barefaced assertion, that the old edition is better than this new one. I quite agree with the Messrs. Black that the old work was excellent; but if so, the revised one must be better, unless indeed in the eyes of some over-sensitive writer whose papers are a little touched up. Granting for the sake of argument (what I do not admit), that I have introduced ten errors where I have corrected one hundred, the benefits to the purchasers of the new edition are as ninety to ten. But there is a feature the Reviewer has left in the shade, which alone gives a highly increased value to this edition, and that is the *Index*, to form which I read the work through a second time. In this there are about a thousand articles not to be found under the alphabet in the body of the work, yet relating to highly important topics. I have no doubt that if the Reviewer will take his new copy to a bookseller, he will be able to get the old edition in exchange, and a sum of money to boot.

I have perhaps taken more notice of the matter than it deserves—certainly more than a mere regard for my own literary character demanded, since the *animus* of the paper is so manifest. But I feel that I owe it to the publishers not to allow their work to be depreciated even by an anonymous and evidently prejudiced and uncharitable Reviewer.

I am, Sir,

Your faithful servant,

Clifton Reynes, Jan. 24, 1857.

HENRY BURGESS.

To the Editor of the Eclectic Review.

MY DEAR SIR.—I am obliged by the opportunity you have afforded me of making some remarks on Dr. Burgess's reply to my article in the last month's REVIEW. They will of necessity be brief, the whole interval between my receiving his strictures and sending this letter not being longer than a few hours; and, were it otherwise, I have no desire whatever to protract a disagreeable discussion. I need not assure you that my censures were not dictated by any personal ill-feeling against Dr. Burgess; but I wish, at the outset, through you, to assure him that this is the case. I have just read the article through again, and I really do not see what ground he has for charging what I have said, with "exhibiting so plainly an *animus* unfavourable" to himself, "apart from any statement of facts or conclusions legitimately drawn from them." That I have said some things which are severe I do not wish to deny, but I am utterly unconscious of having made any statement from personal feeling. The facts which I adduced seemed, to me, to justify all that I said, and I have now nothing to retract. I thought I had a duty to perform to the public, and also to the original writers. It appeared to me that Dr. Burgess had done a wrong to both. Other less interested parties must judge whether the facts warrant the severity. It is satisfactory to find that not one of the statements of fact adduced is disputed. Many of them are ignored; in regard to others, an attempt is made to explain them, so as to shift the blame from the reviser; but there is no attempt made to disprove any one fact. Surely this may be taken as something like evidence that the reviser of the book, and not Dr. Burgess personally, or in any other character, was the object of the censure. Would a writer, whose object was to mask an attack on Dr. Burgess, under cover of the Cyclopædia, have been so careful in adducing his authorities? I know not, for I am not in the habit of writing so. But, at any rate, I distinctly and emphatically disclaim any *malus animus* in the case. Let me proceed to state very briefly the grounds on which, I think, the severity of

my censures was justifiable. I must recall the charges which I brought in the Review. They relate to three points—1. The correction of errors of typography and arrangements. 2. The insertion of new articles. 3. The alterations in existing articles.

In regard to the first point, Dr. Burgess wholly passes by my statements in respect to erroneous references to articles professedly in the Cyclopædia. What I said is true—that the revision did not extend to this numerous and important class of errors; and I think I was justified in asking, “what claim has he to the character of a ‘careful’ reviser, who does not appear even to have noticed their existence?” As to corrections of typography, Dr. Burgess is indignant at my having suggested that they were not made by himself, and calls this a *suggestio falsi* on my part, by which, if these words have any proper meaning, he must intend to say that I made this suggestion knowing or believing it to be false. This I most decidedly deny. Dr. Burgess’s distinct statement—that he made them all—of course settles the question. Still, I am at a loss to understand the matter; for in a later part of the letter, Dr. Burgess says he does not believe that he “touched the article *Hook*, except to correct the Hebrew.” Certainly, seven corrections are attempted in that article, and only one of them is Hebrew; and as certainly two (or, more properly, three) mistakes in the Hebrew remain untouched.

In regard to the new articles introduced, the errors I have pointed out are not denied; but Dr. Burgess says “I am not to be blamed, though I am responsible, for the articles were supplied by a gentleman, in whom I thought I could place confidence.” I do not profess to understand the rule, according to which Dr. Burgess apportions blame; but one would have thought that he who was *responsible* for any statement, was blameable, if that statement were erroneous. Dr. Burgess, I take for granted, cannot intend to deny this. His meaning must surely be, that he is not to be blamed as being the actual perpetrator of such blunders. But who did blame him for this? Certainly, I did not; for I have distinctly said, in regard to the fabulous Augusta, wife of Herod, that “there is good reason to think that the mistake did not originate with himself.” I had conjectured these articles were taken from the rough and uncorrected notes of Dr. Kitto—and this, Dr. Burgess calls an insinuation, “as false as it is uncharitable and slanderous.” Really, where is the uncharitableness of saying that Dr. Burgess was not the author of such blunders; and where can be the slander, when, in fact, Dr. Burgess acknowledges that these very articles are not his own. It gives me very great pleasure, however, to know that Dr. Kitto was in no way concerned in them.

In regard to additions made to articles, the charges I brought were these: that one class of them, the insertion of recent publications, “had been made partially and at random;”—that in the additions of new matter, there was evidence of great carelessness and want of acquaintance with the subjects;—and, moreover, that a wrong had been done to the original writers, by making them appear responsible for these faults introduced. Not one of the statements of fact, on which these charges rest, is denied. But it is alleged that there is a reason for the incompleteness of the new matter, which “your Reviewer conceals, although aware of it,” viz., that the work was printed from the old stereotype plates; and, consequently, alterations could not easily be made. How I can be charged with concealing that which I have distinctly asserted, and more than once implied (as in the remarks on the article *David*), I am at a loss to understand. I know of no ground which Dr. Burgess can have, for saying that I was aware of this fact, except my own assertion of it in the Article itself—and of course every reader of the Article has the same opportunity of

knowing it. I have not, I think, even implied a censure on Dr. Burgess, for having made so few alterations. Certainly, I did not mean to do so. What I have said is, that the alterations made were of very little worth, and showed a want of acquaintance with the subjects. This is not disproved by the fact of Dr. Burgess's degrees, nor by the long list of testimonials to his scholarship, which he takes this opportunity of exhibiting. The question is, whether he has shown here—in this work—competent scholarship? Let any reader turn to pp. 93—95 of the Review, and judge for himself. The wrong done to the original writers, by the insertion, as theirs, of Dr. Burgess's additions, including the blunders, is very slightly noticed by him. He evidently does not feel it to be a wrong, and would, therefore, naturally think my remarks severe. It is, however, somewhat out of place, I think, to pass it over with an ill-timed pleasantry about "some oversensitive writer, whose papers are *a little touched up*." In another part of the letter, he indulges in a vein of pleasantry, respecting my remarks on typographical errata, which is equally out of place, and which requires no answer.

I added as a sort of appendix, an account of the article *David*. This, Dr. Burgess disposes of by making the publishers responsible for the statement. Yet their account is inconsistent with his. He declared that "the life of David has been entirely re-written, from the pen of Dr. Kitto." They say in their letter (written after Dr. Kitto's death): "We have made great alterations in the life of David." Dr. Burgess seems inclined also to throw off somewhat more of his responsibility on to their shoulders,—they, he says "are responsible for the information that the work was *thoroughly revised*." The title-page states that it is "carefully revised by *Rev. Henry Burgess, LL.D., &c.*"

I have only one other remark to make. Dr. Burgess is indignant at my supposing that he is not familiar with German writers. I state the grounds on which I came to that conclusion to be, that the work itself shows no such acquaintance with German as to make it probable that he had derived information directly from that source. He says this is "a statement whose falseness is only equalled by its impertinence." That the statement is impertinent I cannot admit. If I found reason from the work for thinking that Dr. Burgess's acquaintance with German was very slight, as I surely did, it was not impertinent to say so. If the statement is false, it is another matter, and I will retract it as soon as I have evidence to the contrary, but it must be other evidence than that supplied by "acquaintance with foreign booksellers," or the number of "new foreign works" passing through his hands.

I am,

My dear sir,

Yours sincerely,

THE REVIEWER.

January 26, 1857.

P.S.—It is quite possible that in my haste, I may have passed over some parts of Dr. Burgess's letter which might seem to require an answer. I wish, therefore, distinctly to say, that I have not intentionally omitted anything, and I hope that what I have said will be a sufficient proof, that if there is any such omission, it has arisen from no other cause than haste.

In consequence of the late period at which we received the foregoing correspondence, we have been compelled, in order to make room for it, to postpone our usual "Brief Notices" of Books, and other matter.—*Ed. E. R.*

Books Received.

- Andrew's (W. P., F.R.G.S.) *The Euphrates Valley Route to India*. 267 pp. and maps. Allen & Co.
 Anti-Slavery Advocate for January. William Tweedie.
 Barrett's (Rev. A.) *Consolator; or, Recollections of the Rev. Jno. Pearson*. 186 pp. Hamilton & Co.
 Blaikie's (Rev. Wm. G., A.M.) *David, King of Israel*. 439 pp. Edinburgh: Constable & Co.
 Bomberger's (Dr.) *Protestant Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia*. Part III. T. & T. Clark.
 Bonar's (Dr. H.) *Desert of Sinai*. 408 pp. James Nisbet & Co.
 British Controversialist and Literary Magazine for January. Houlston & Wright.
 British Quarterly Review. No. XLIX. Jackson & Walford.
 Campbell's (Calder) *Episodes in the War-Life of a Soldier*. 248 pp. William Skeffington.
 Church of England Quarterly Review. No. LXXXI. Partridge & Co.
 Clarke's (J. E., M.A.) *Heart-Music for Working People*. 122 pp. Partridge & Co.
 Commentary Wholly Biblical. Part III. Bagster & Sons.
 Congregational Year Book, 1857. Jackson & Walford.
 Cumming's (Dr.) *Bible Revision and Translation*. 60 pp. Hall, Virtue, & Co.
 Dickson's (Rev. John Bathurst) *The Temple-Lamp*. 376 pp. James Nisbet.
 Doran's (Dr.) *Monarchs Retired from Business*. 2 vols., 416 and 420 pp. Richard Bentley.
 Dulcken's (H. W.) *Book of German Songs. In German and in English*. 324 pp. Ward & Lock.
 Edney's (A.) *Thoughts on Anti-Supernaturalism*. 16 pp. E. T. Whitfield, 178, Strand.
 Educator for January. Ward & Co.
 Evans's (Alfred Bowen) *Lectures on the Book of Job*. 244 pp. Bosworth & Harrison.
 Farr's (Ed.) *Every Child's Scripture History*. 124 pp. Dean & Son.
 FitzGerald's (Jno., M.A.) *Duty of Procuring More Rest for Labouring Classes*. W. H. Dalton.
 Guizot's *Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel*. 398 pp. Richard Bentley.
 Harris's (Devon) *Lota; and other Poems*. 139 pp. Smith, Elder, & Co.
 Hassall's (Dr.) *Adulterations Detected in Food and Medicine*. 712 pp. Longmans.
 Heraud's (John A.) *The Judgment of the Flood*. 376 pp. D. Bogue.
 Landel's (Rev. Wm.) *What is Religion; or, Religious Life Practically Considered*. Ward & Co.
 Leisure Hour for December. Religious Tract Society.
 Lloyd's (Rev. Morgan) *Three Crosses of Calvary*. 193 pp. John Snow.
 Loftus's *Travels and Researches in Chaldæa and Susiana*. 436 pp., maps & plates. Nisbet & Co.
 London University Magazine for January. Hall, Virtue, and Co.
 Lorimer's (Rev. Peter) *Precursors of Knox: I. Patrick Hamilton*. 267 pp. Constable & Co.
 Luther's Table-Talk. 492 pp. Bohn's Standard Library.
 Lyndhurst's (Lord) *Review of the Divorce Bill of 1856*. 146 pp. J. W. Parker & Son.
 McGill's (Rev. J.) *The Four Centurions; or, Christianity and the Military Profession*. D. Bryce.
 McIntosh's (Maria) *Violet; or, Found at Last*. 305 pp. G. Routledge & Co.
 Macleod's (Rev. N.) *The Home School; or, Hints on Home Education*. 175 pp. Paton & Ritchie.
 Martineau's (Jas.) *Discourse on Commercial Morals: "Owe no Man anything."* 22 pp. Longmans.
 Maurice's (F. D., M.A.) *Discourses on the Gospel of St. John*. 501 pp. Macmillan & Co.
 Mind's Mirror: Poetical Sketches, with Minor Poems. By M. J. J.—n. 280 pp. Jas. Hogg.
 Muir's *Glimpses of Prophet-Life: Lessons from the History of Jonah*. 234 pp. Shepherd & Elliot.
 National Review. No. VII. Chapman & Hall.
 Occasional Paper of Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society. No. XIII.
 Paragraph Bible in Separate Books. Leviticus; 76 pp., and map. Numbers; 108 pp., and map.
 Matthew; 76 pp., and map. Mark; 52 pp., and map. Romans; 34 pp., and map. Corinthians;
 54 pp., and map. Bagster & Sons.
 Peace's (Wm.) *Comprehensive Review of the Denison Heresy*. 162 pp. Partridge & Co.
 Phillpson's (Caroline Giffard) *Eva: a Romance in Rhyme*. 134 pp. John Moxon.
 Positive Religion *versus* Negative Morality: Letters from the Protesters. 51 pp. Wm. Freeman.
 Ramsay's (Geo., B.M.) *Principles of Psychology*. 395 pp. Walton & Maberly.
 Readings from the Best Divines. No. I. James Nisbet & Co.
 Religion in Earnest: Tales from the German. Transl. by Mrs. S. Carr. 334 pp. Shepherd & Elliot.
 Review of Life, Character, and Policy of Napoleon III. By a British Officer. 426 pp. Longmans.
 Revue Chrétienne for January. Paris: Ch. Meyrueis & Co.
 Smith's (Dr. Wm.) *Student's Gibbon's Rome*. 677 pp. John Murray.
 Spence's (Dr. Jas.) *Pastor's Prayer for the People's Weal*. 128 pp. J. Nisbet & Co.
 Sunday at Home for December. Religious Tract Society.
 The Book and its Missions.—Past and Present. Vol. I. 292 pp. W. Kent & Co.
 Vicary's (Rev. M.) *Pencilings in Poetry*. 224 pp. A. Hall, Virtue, & Co.
 Wanderer (The): *Fantasia and Vision, &c.* By the Smith of Smitheden. 381 pp. Jas. Hogg.
 Westropp's (Mrs. J. E.) *Summer Experiences of Rome, Perugia, and Siena, in 1854*. W. Skeffington.
 Williams's (Rev. C.) *George Mogridge: his Life, Character, and Writings*. 370 pp. Ward & Lock.
 Williams's (Rev. C.) *Silver-Shell; or, the Adventures of an Oyster*. 184 pp. Ward & Lock.
 Winslow's (Dr. Forbes) *Journal of Psychological Medicine*. No. V. John Churchill.